W. Fordage

THE

Holy Cheat:

Proving, from the Undeniable

PRACTICES and POSITIONS

OF THE

PRESBYTERIANS,

That the design of that PARTY, is to enslave both

King and People,

UNDER THE

Masque of Religion.

By a Person of Quality.

LONDON,
Printed for *B. C.* and are to be sold by the
Booksellers of *London* and *Westminster*.
MDCLXXXVIII.

LIBRARY
TRINITY COLLEGE

THE

Holy Cheat:

PROVING,

From the undenyable Practices and Positions of the Presbyterians, *that the design of that Party is to enslave both King and Kingdom, under the Masque of* Religion, *&c.*

IF the Author of the *Interest of England*, &c. had meant fairly to the Question, he would as well have told us the *Good* of *Bishops*, and the *Ill* of *Presbyters*, as he hath done the contrary, and never have concluded *For*, or *Against Either*, from the *Best* Actions of the *One*, and the *Worst* of the *Other*. At least, a man would think this partiality of Method, might content him without the service of those little Arts he uses to aid, and recommennd his Undertaking. The Present state of things, he represents quite other than it is: and raises thence a Political expedience of doing This, or That, of Linking Interests, *&c.* never considering, that he Himself Creates that Interest, and gives Affairs the Face of that expedience. *Page the* 16. he laies his ground-work, In these following words.

Among the various dis-agreeing Parties within this Kingdom, which seem to render it an indigested Mass of people; two main ones appear above the rest, of so large an interest, that if by any means they might become no more twain, but one; they would take in, and carry along the whole stream and strength of the Nation. And these two are the Episcopal *and* Presbyterian *Parties, each of them highly laying claim to the Portestant Religion. And undoubtedly whilst these two re-*

main

main divided, the Kingdom of England, *and the Proteſtant Religion is divided againſt it ſelf. This diſ-union is removed either by the Abolition of one Party, or by the Coalition of both into one. The former if ſuppoſed poſſible, cannot be accompliſhed but by violent and perilious ways and means. The latter is brought to paſs by Accommodation or mutual yielding. Moreover there is a third way imaginable, Toleration indulged to the weaker ſide. In which of theſe ways lies the true Intereſt of the King and Kingdom is the great Caſe of the time, and the Subject of this Diſcourſe, which preſumes not to inform his Majeſty, but in ſubordination unto his declared moderation and condeſcention, endeavours, by ſhewing things as they are, to convince and perſuade Intereſſed perſons, that the Pacification begun for this* Interim *may be intire and perfect, and fully ſetled for perpetual unity.*

Let it be here obſerved, *Firſt*, what the *Difference* is; *Next*, betwixt *whom*; In the *Third* place, the *Danger* of it; And *Laſtly*, the *Expedient* to Remove it.

It ſeems, the *Epiſcopal*, and *Presbyterian* Parties, United in *Religion*, cannot Agree yet about *Diſcipline*, and *while Theſe Two remain Divided*, the Publick is in Danger. From Hence reſults the *Intereſt* of *Mutual Yielding*— (his *Coalition of Both Parties into One*) Upon which Hinge, moves the whole frame of his Deſign; and in Two Pages, he gives the *Presbyter* Poſſeſſion of his Claim, Deciding with exceeding eaſe, *the Caſe of King and Kingdom.*

Opinion is a great Miſtreſs: for that which *He* ſo Magiſterially Lays down, and Challenges, appears to Me, miſ-ſtated, and worſe Managed. I muſt confeſs, his Reduction of all other *Intereſts* under *Epiſcopal* and *Presbyterian*, is in ſome ſenſe, no ill *Dichotomy*, That is; Intended of the Two mayn Parties, whereof, the One's Againſt the Law, the Other for it: But why the ſingle Presbyterian ſhould be Eſteemed the Ballance of the Nation, I cannot Comprehend. If they are ſo, they ſhould do well to caſt their Cauſe upon a Popular Vote, and try the Iſſue by the Poll. For Quiet ſake, no matter; *Many* or *Few*; there may be *Equity* where there wants *Number*. Wee'll rather ſee in point of *Right*, what 'tis they inſiſt upon. [*Only exemption from Epiſcopal Authority, in things Indifferent, and of Humane Inſtitution.*] To Cleer this point, *We* have *a judgment of Diſcretion* too, as well as *They*; A Freedom, and Capacity to diſtinguiſh betwixt a *Scandal Given*, and *Taken*; betwixt an *In-conformity* proceeding from *Conſcience*, and from *Paſſion*. Where the Diſſent proceeds from

Con-

Conſcience, a *Toleration* clears That Scruple: but our good peoples Liberty conſiſts in Burthening Others, as well as freeing Themſelves; and That's *Intolerable.*

How many ſtrange Indecencies are here, one upon the neck of Another! Firſt, here's the *Minor* part impoſing upon the *Major*: Secondly, a *Novel*, and *Vulgar Imagination*, bearing down an *Apoſtolical Inſtitution*: Thirdly, a *Private Opinion*, conteſting with a *Solemn*, and *Publick Sanction*: and Finally, the Subject of all this Earneſtneſs, in their own phraſe, is but a very *Accommodable difference.* From what I have ſaid, I am perſuaded, that *Tenderneſs* to the *Conſcientious*, and *Severity* to the *Pertinacious Presbyter*, is the true Intereſt of this Nation. Well! But this Gentleman tells us, that *Abolition if Poſſible, is Perillous*, and *Toleration* only an *Imaginary* Remedy. Is not this to Intimate, that the Party makes leſs Conſcience of a *Tumult*, than of a *Ceremony*: and to argue the *neceſſity* of *Complying*, from the *Danger* of *Refuſing*? What would theſe people do if they had Power, that are ſo Bold without it! And yet our Politician tells us; It is the Kings Intereſt to Cloſe with them; He means perchance, *According to the Covenant.* The *Coalition*, There, of all Schiſms, and Hereſies into One Intereſt, was of great Reaſon, and Important Service to the Common work: but we are now adviſing how to *Settle*, not to *Diſjoynt* a Government, and to Incorporate Diſ-agreements, were to *begin* upon a Principle of *Confuſion.* As the Caſe ſtands with us, in my weak Judgment, *Perſons* ſhould rather be Indulg'd, than *Parties.* My Reaſon is This; Some *Individuals* of that Perſuaſion, have done His Majeſty ſome Service, but (to the beſt of my Remembrance) the *Entire Party*, never any.

Yet One Reflexion more. Allow theſe People all their Askings, in what concerns their *Diſcipline*; Will they reſt Quiet There, without a further Hankering after more? (the *Legiſlative Power* perhaps; the *Militia*; or ſome ſuch Trifle.) I am the more ſuſpicious, becauſe I do not well remember, where ever That Party was ſatisfied with leſs than All. Nor need I look far back for Inſtances to juſtifie my fears; But having in ſome meaſure hitherto Diſcovered his Foundation, wee'll forward now, and ſee what work he makes upon this Sandy Bottom: Taking his Title-page in my way; for to my thinking he ſtumbles at the Threſhold. It runs thus.

The *Intereſt* of *England* in the Matter of *RELIGION*, unfolded in the Solution of theſe Three *Queſtions*.

I. Q. *Whether the* Presbyterian *Party ſhould in Juſtice, or Reaſon of State be Rejected and Depreſſed, or Protected and Incouraged?*

II. Q. *Whether the* Presbyterian *Party may be Protected and Incouraged, and the* Epiſcopal *not Deſerted nor Diſ-obliged?*

III. Q. *Whether the Upholding of both Parties by a juſt and equal Accommodation, be not in it ſelf more deſirable and more agreeable to the State of* England, *Then the abſolute Exalting of the one Party, and the total Subverſion of the other?*

Written by *J. C.*

I would fain know what's meant by *The Matter of Religion*, as it ſtands here related to *Civil Intereſt? Doctrine* it cannot be, for That were to adviſe a yielding upon a Principle of Policy, in Oppoſition to a Rule of Conſcience: ſubjecting *Intereſt* of *Religion*, which is *Eternal Happineſs*, to *Reaſon of State*, which regards but *Temporal Convenience*. If it be *Diſcipline*, What's that to the *Intereſt of England?* Our Settlement depends upon a due Obedience to the Eſtabliſh'd Law; not the Encouraging of froward Humours, by an Audacious, and miſ-govern'd-Zeal, under pretext of *Conſcience*, to Affront it. Let *Authority Reform*, and *Private Perſons*, either *Obey*, or *Suffer*; we are to Anſwer for our own faults, not thoſe of the *Government*. And in fine, *If the Hill will not come to* Mahomet, *let* Mahomet *go to the Hill.*

After a pleaſant *Breviate* of the Story of our late Troubles, (handſomly Penn'd indeed) in his tenth Page he takes his Biaſs.

At length (ſays he) *a full Tide of Concurring Accidents carries him* (the Duke of *Albemarle*, then General) *to a cloſure with the ſober part of the Parliamentary party, who from firſt to laſt intended only a Reformation, and* due regulation *of things in Church and State, but abhorred the thought of deſtroying the King, or changing the Fundamental Laws of the Kingdom.*

I thought

I thought *the Act of* Pardon *and* Oblivion, had quieted all Animosities, and silenc'd all Discourses of this Quality; but 'tis, it seems, *The Interest of* England *in the matter of Religion*, to keep the Quarrel waking; and by Asserting the proceedings of the two Houses in the late War, to engage this King within the danger of his Fathers President. To be as free with the Authour, as he is with his Majesty, I'le put his meaning in a little plainer English.

Beside the Grand Division of the Nation into a *Royal*, and a *Popular* Party; that Party which he here calls *Parliamentary*, is again *Split*; and under this Subdivision, are Comprised, those which *did Actually* destroy the King; and those which *by good Fortune*, did it *not*. (Plainer yet; *Presbyterians*, and *Independents*.) The *Sober part*, (meaning the *Presbyterian*) He justifies *from first to last*, even to their very *Intentions*. (I must tread warily, for I am here upon a narrow, and a slippery path,) Not to Dispute the mans *Intuitive Knowledg*; wee'll rather modestly believe that They mistook their way, than He, their meaning: for certainly, the *Murther* of the King, was not the only unlawful violence Acted upon that Sacred Person, and he that stops there, does as much as nothing. I would not touch upon this subject, were I not bound by Oath, and Duty, to discharge my soul, in what concerns the Honour, and the Safety of my Prince. Can *the first Cause, asserted by both Houses*, in opposition to His late Majesty, be *justify'd*, and not the King *condemn'd*? And is not the *Honor*, and *Safety* of His Majesty that now is, concern'd in these *Indignities* upon His Murther'd Father? What was *Then* Lawful, is so *Still*: and He that but implicitly charges the *Last King*, strikes at *This*. The text will bear no other sense without a Torture. But I shall by and by, compare him with himself. In the mean while we may explain one Presbyterian by another. *Douglas*, in 1651. preach'd the Kings *Coronation-Sermon*. Which since His Majesty's Return, is over and over again Re-printed.

A King (says he) *abusing his Power to the overthrow of Religion, Laws and Liberties, which are the very Fundamentals of this contract and Covenant may be controlled and opposed; and if he set himself to overthrow all these by Arms, then they who have power, as the Estates of a Land, may and ought to resist by Arms; Because he doth, by that opposition, break the very bonds, and overthroweth all the essentials of this Contract and Covenant. This may serve to Justifie the proceedings of this Kingdom against the late King,*

who

who in an hoſtile way ſet himſelf to overthrow Religion, Parliaments, Laws, and Liberties.

I think this needs no comment, —— About the ſame time, *Smectymnuus was revived by* Mr. *Manton*, (a moſt aſpicious welcome doubtleſs to his Majeſty) wherein five Champions of the Cauſe take up the Cudgels againſt one Biſhop, on the behalf of Scandalous Pamphlets, and Tumultuary Petitions againſt Epiſcopacy. This is the naked Truth, what ever the Jolly Prieſt may tell the *Reader*, of *the* * *Faction againſt which they dealt. Five Orthodox Divines* he ſays were the Authors. *Four* of the *Five* I ſhall not mention, the *Fifth* was *Marſhall*, of whoſe *Divinity*, a Taſt; that by the ſweet Agreement, we may the better Judge of Mr. *Mantons*. In a *Letter printed* 1643. arguing for the Authority of the two Houſes. *pag.*14. Thus: *Let every ſoul in* England *be ſubject to King and Parliament, for they are the higher powers ordained unto you of God, whoſoever therefore reſiſteth King and Parliament, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God, and they that reſiſt, ſhall receive to themſelves damnation.* The man was no Conjurer; yet he had wit enough, when *Presbytery* went down, to Court the riſing Intereſt; and *though the Common Prayer was an Abomination*, to marry his Daughter by it, for fear of Afterclaps. But I ſuppoſe 'twas huddled up, as they do in their Churches that no man might be able to make Oath 'twas not the *Directory*. If the Caſe had been concerning *the Allowance of Chriſtian Burial to a Gentleman that was Quartered for his Loyalty.* Or *to Determine in the great point of the Late Kings Death, (upon an Anniverſary Faſt) whether or no 'twas Murther:* Truly conſidering *the Potent Arguments brought on both ſides*, 'tis poſſible that Mr. *Marſhal* would have contented himſelf (as well as his Neighbours) to put the Caſe, and leave the point at laſt undecided to his Auditory.

Not to ſpend time, and paper needleſly, the whole ſtream of the *Diſciplinarians* runs this way: only perhaps more or leſs Bold, and Open, according to the preſent ſtrength, or weakneſs of the Faction. But to return. Can any thing be more gentle than **A Reformation, and due Regulation of things in Church, and State?** (*words ſmoother than Oyl, yet are they very ſwords.)*

Firſt, to *Reform*, and *Regulate*, belongs to the Supreme Magiſtrate; if they intended *That*, they were to blame. Now take it in a Qualify'd, and ſofter ſenſe, 'twas a **Due Regulation** they Intended. To put this General notion in more Intelligible terms; upon this point depends no leſs than all that's dear to every Honeſt

neſt man. The *Dignity of the King*, the *Liberty* of the *Subject*, the *Freedom of Parliaments*, and the *Honor* of the *Nation*. God knows my thoughts, I do not envy any man, either the Benefit of His Majeſties *Mercy*, or the Bleſſing of his *Favour*, that hath the Grace at laſt, not to Abuſe it. I look upon his Royal Act of Pardon with Reverence; and upon every ſoul within that Pale, as in a Sanctuary. But yet I do not underſtand a *Pardon* for one Rebellion, to be a *Diſpenſation* for another, nor how the Argument lyes from Fact, to Right. Under theſe two words, **The Regulation**; Thus much is comprehended, (waiving *leſs* Differences, and *Greater*.)

Presbyterian Regulation.

Firſt, *The transferring of the Power of chuſing Great Officers, and Miniſters of State; from the King to the Two Houſes.*

2. *All matters of State, in the Interval of Parliaments muſt be Debated, and Concluded by a Council ſo Choſen, and in number, not above twenty five, nor under fifteen; and no Publick Act eſteemed of any Validity, as proceeding from the Royal Authority, unleſs it be done by the Advice and Conſent of the Major part of that Council; Atteſted under their Hands. And Theſe too, ſworn to the ſenſe of Both Houſes.*

3. *The Lords and Commons muſt be intruſted with the* Militia.

4. *His Majeſty may* appoint, *but the Two Houſes, or the Council, (in ſuch manner as aforeſaid) muſt* Approve *of All Governours of Forts, and Caſtles.*

Laſtly, *No Peers hereafter made, muſt ſit, or Vote in Parliament, unleſs Admitted thereunto by the conſent of Both Houſes.*

Upon theſe Terms; *His Majeſty ſhall be ſupported, in Honor, and Plenty; by his moſt Humble and Faithful Subjects, who have in their Thoughts, and Deſires nothing more Precious, (next to the Honour, and immediate Service of God) than their juſt, and faithful performance of their Duty to the King, and Kingdom.*

This is the **True Regulation** *they Intended*: (for ſure they *Meant* what they *Propoſed*, to our Late Sovereign. I ſpeak not this, of *Perſons*, but of the Groſs of the Party; nor to reproach that neither; but to remove a *Scandal* from the Aſhes of that Bleſſed

Bleſſed *Martyr*; and to direct a *Reverence* towards his Succeſſor. What provocation have theſe reſtleſs People, now to revive This Queſtion, but an unruly Impotency of paſſion againſt the Government? This is their way. In *Generals*, they juſtifie from firſt to laſt, the Presbyterians Cauſe. The Multitude, they, look into *Particulars*: and from thoſe Injuries which the Late King ſuffered, draw Inferences Diſhonourable, and Dangerous to This. In the next Period, methinks he falls upon a *Non ſequitur*.

The Re-admiſſion of the Secluded Members, (he ſaies) *did Neceſſarily draw after it, the reſtoring of King, Lords, and Commons, according to the Ancient Conſtitution.* Pag. 10. Not *Neceſſarily*, (under Favour) *according to the Ancient Conſtitution*: (I will not ſay, nor *probably*; but) there were *two ſhrewd Blocks caſt in the way. The* Firſt, in the *Militia*; where no Comiſſionated Officer was to Act, that ſhould not firſt acknowledge in theſe words, *viz.*

I do acknowledge and Declare, that the War undertaken by Both Houſes of Parliament in their Defence againſt the Forces raiſed in the Name of the Late King, was Juſt and Lawful; and that Magiſtracy and Miniſtery, are the Ordinances of God.

The Second, was in the excluſion of the Royal Party from the next Choice, as followeth.

Reſolved that all and every Perſon who have adviſed or voluntarily aided, abetted, or aſſiſted, in any War againſt the Parliament (ſince the firſt day of January 1641.*) his or their Sons, unleſs he or they have ſince Manifeſted their good affections to this Parliament, ſhall be uncapable to be elected to ſerve as Members of the next Parliament.*

Now how a Choice thus limited in the Houſe, and Principled in the Field, ſhould *Neceſſarily* ſet us right, does not to me appear. Perhaps it was the moſt the Time would bear: but God forbid, *That Declaration charging the Guilt, and Blood of the late War upon the King*, ſhould ſtand upon Record to future Generations. *Whoever affirms, That War* was *lawfull*, does beyond Queſtion, *meditate Another*; not to ſay more then needs; It Blaſts the Memory of the Late King, and upon the King that now is, it reflects many Miſchiefs: ſubjecting both his Dignity, and Perſon to His Fathers Hazzards. It adminiſters Argument for a new War; and ſhakes the very Foundation of Royalty. Allow but *That*; the Act of Oblivion is on the wrong ſide; If the King was in Fault, the Presbyterians muſt Grant the Pardon from the clear

Reaſon

Reaſon of the matter in it ſelf, and from the obvious Conſequences; (beſide that juſtice which both King and People owe to the Aſhes of a Father and a Soveraign) It ſeems to me of high Concern, to Counterſtate that Declaration, and *Place the Militia of this Nation now in ſuch hands as will acknowledge the Late Kings Quarrel was Defenſive.* I am the bolder in this Particular, becauſe I find the Faction preſſing beyond both Modeſty and Reaſon, upon this Bottom. Where Majeſty it ſelf is Affronted, it were a ſecond Injury to allow the Servant better Quarter, than the Maſter. But they are very Exact, and Careſull in this Point: as will appear in what follows.

After a dreadful Earthquake, ſhaking all the Powers of the Kingdom, and overturning the very Foundations, and after a new frame of things, erected, ſtanding for divers years, & ſeemingly ſtated for perpetuity; the Regal Family and Government is raiſed up again, no thy the Power or Policy of that Party who fought under the Banner of his late Majeſty in the Wars, between Him & both Houſes of Parliament; *But by the reſtleſs deſire of the Nation, and the vigorous actings of the City of* London, *with the concurrence of the Secluded Members of the Long Parliament, in conjunction with that Renowned Perſon who then held the power of the Sword.* Pag. 12. Let it be noted here, that (by his Confeſſion) *the War was between the King and both Houſes of Parliament.* Now *to that Party who fought under the Banner of His Late Majeſty*; (whom he might have ſpared for the General's ſake) Truly Conſidering what havock hath been made of them, by *Slaughters, Extrajudicial Sentences, Plunders, Sequeſtrations, Impriſonments, Baniſhments*; *Shipping them away into Plantations* &c.———And this for twenty years continuance. 'Tis no great wonder to find ſome Abatement of their Power. But to affirm they contributed nothing to His Majeſties Reſtauration, is very unkind, and ſomething Raſh; The *Nation* did; (he ſayes) the *City* of *London*, and the *Secluded Members* of the *Long Parliament*; but not *That Party*. A pleaſant and Phantaſtical Diſ-junction! This way of barely Affirming, and Denying; Crying One Party Up, and the Other Down, and proving nothing, is neither Mannerly, nor Prudent. How comes this man of *Metaphyſical Inſpection*, that reads the very *Thoughts* of the *Presbyterians*, and ſeems ſo well enformed in all the *Actings* of the *Royal Party*; How comes he by this wonderous Inſight and Intelligence? Does he not find that all he ſayes is nothing, unleſs he can *See things Inviſible, and Prove Negatives*? Is This the Work of the Spirit of

Pacification? Or will he tell us, in the Holy Dialect, that *'tis the Enmity betwixt the Seed of the Woman and the Seed of the Serpent*? So far were *we*, (for I write my ſelf of that Party) from this Unfriendly, and Unchriſtian Temper of Diſ-uniting, that we Declared unanimouſly againſt it, binding our ſelves by all that's Sacred, to an Eternal Union with all Parties, in order to the Reſtauration of His Majeſty, all Differences apart; of what Degree or Quality ſoever. In This we had an eye to the Kings Intereſt, and to the Nations; for it Referred both to His Majeſties Return, and to a Laſting Peace: the former being Facilitated by that Conjunction of *Intereſt*; and the Latter provided for by a Conciliation of *Affections* to be wrought by ſuppreſſing all *Motions* toward Revenge in the one Party, and the *Fears* of it in the *other*. It had been good manners to have met us half way; but truly high Diſcretion, as well as Common Equity, to Cloſe with us, and entertain the Offer. Now far from this, we do not only get not one *Good* word, but many a *Bad* one; *Such as thoſe People that will never Leave the King, are to expect from ſuch as do not love Him.* Our Adverſary talks much of the *Goſpel*. Is it a *Goſpel-Precept, to render Evil for Good*? What I have ſhewed already, that the Kings Party did, amounts to ſomewhat more than nothing. We'll ſee a little further, allowing yet to all that Acted in that work their ſhare of Glory.

The Duke of *Albemarle* was the Leading Card, *then in the head of an Army, better diſpos'd to his Command, than Deſign*; and to him the Honeſt part of the City and Nation were no ill Seconds. But till he had taſted and try'd them, he did well to walk warily: and rather take the middle and ſafer way of Gratifying All Intereſts then on foot, then the more Poſitive, and Hazzardous, of diſobliging any two Parties, in favour of the Third.

For there were then Three ſeveral Intereſts in Play; The *Kings*, the *Presbyterians*, and the *Phanatiques*; the *Royal Party* preſs'd for a Free Choice and Convention, without *Prelimitation*. The *Presbyterians urg'd a* Re-admiſſion of the *Secluded Members*. The *Phanatiques*, they were for filling up the Houſe, acording to ſuch Qualifications as the Rump ſhould reſolve upon. The Courſe the General ſteer'd was This: The *Rump* Continued; the *Secluded Members* Returned; and the *Royaliſts* were ſatisfy'd, with the Aſſurance of a new Choice ſoon After. His Excellence acting in this Affair rather as a Conciliator, than a Party, and in order to a Settlement, giving things the beſt Conſiſtency they would

would then bear. *But had the ancient Stock of Royaliſts no hand at all in this procurement?* It never came to blows, ſo that the matter Reſts upon the Effects of Policy, & Councel; whereof our undertaker cannot give any abſolute account, nor ſhall we in our juſt Apology, exalt our ſelves, and Cry, *We, brought the King in.* That's *Presbyterian Language.* We did not drive Him out, we'll ſay; and that we joyn'd with many Thouſands, as honeſt as our ſelves, in Duty to Reſtore Him. Where there was place for Action, and to do the King a ſervice that way, we never Articled for Offices or Rewards, but without further care of Intereſt, purſu'd our Duties. In fine, the Loyal part of the Nation was animated by the ſame Soul, joyn'd Stocks and Councels: and many thouſands of Brave Fellows that never ſaw the King, were Proud and Ambitious to Dye for Him. I could ſay what was undertaken by the Old Royal Party, particularly, in *Hewſons* Scuffle, (and indeed where not) but that it caſts a Slurr upon ſome of His Majeſties new Friends. This however, thoſe Lads of the City, that would have done the work without more adoe, had they not been Muzzled by ſome of their Mungrel Magiſtrates, that Dined with the *Mayor*, and Supp'd with the *Commitee of Safety*: Thoſe honeſt people will, if need be, bear witneſs for us, and in like manner the whole Nation; That by Action, Counſel, Writing, we did all that was poſſible in the Buſineſs. What I have delivered in defence of the Royal Party, does very well agree with His Majeſties Teſtimony of the Other, in His Gracious Speech to the Houſe of Peers, for haſtning *the Act of indempnity*: which yet our Authour cites againſt us.

My Lords, if you do not joyn with Me in extinguiſhing thoſe fears which keeps mens hearts awake, and apprehenſive of ſafety and ſecurity, you keep Me from performing my promiſe, which if I had not made, I am perſwaded that neither I nor you had been now here: I pray you let Us not deceive thoſe who brought Us, or permitted Us, to come together.

The King does not There ſay ſo much who *Brought* Him in, as who *Permitted* His Reſtoring; Implying too, that He was fain to *Condition* for it, but withal, a great Earneſtneſs to perform His promiſe. Had but this Gentleman conſidered as well what the King ſaid at the *Paſſing* of the *Indempnity*, as the *Haſtening* of this wrangle would have been ſaved. I'le do him the ſervice to mind him of it.

I do very willingly pardon all that is pardoned by this Act of Indempnity, to that time which is mentioned in the Bill. Nay I will tell you, that from that time to this day, I will not uſe great ſeverity, except in ſuch Caſes where the Malice is Notorious, and the Publick Peace exceedingly concerned. But for the time to come, the ſame Diſcretion and Conſcience which diſpoſed Me to the Clemency I have expreſſed, which is moſt agreeable to My Nature, will oblige Me to all Rigor and Severity, how contrary ſoever it be to My Nature, towards thoſe who ſhall not now Acquieſce, but continue to manifeſt their Sedition and Diſlike of the Government either in Action or Words. And I muſt conjure you all (My Lords and Gentlemen) to concur with Me in this juſt and neceſſary Severity; And that you will in your ſeveral Stations, be ſo jealous of the publick peace, and of my particular Honour, that you will cauſe exemplary Juſtice to be done upon thoſe who are guilty of Seditious Speeches, or Writings, as well as thoſe who break out into Seditious Actions: And that you will believe thoſe who delight in reproaching and traducing My Perſon, not to be well affected to you and the Publick Peace. Never King valued himſelf more upon the Affections of His People, than I do; Nor do I know a better way to make My Self ſure of your Affections, than by being Juſt and Kind to you all, and whilſt I am ſo, I pray let the world ſee, that I am poſſeſſed of your Affections. Thus far the Ground work; now the goodly Structure.

His Majeſty thus brought back to a willing and free-ſpirited people by their own Act, (Pag. 14.) *beholds his undoubted Intereſt ſet forth to his hand, and made plain before him, which is no other, than a well tempered and compoſed State of Affairs both Religious and Civil in all his Dominions, by the aboliſhing of former differences, and the reconciling of all reconcileable Parties; and eſpecially of thoſe grand Parties, which (if made one) do upon the matter carry the whole Nation. And this His Majeſties Wiſdom hath already obſerved in that excellent Proclamation againſt vitious, debauched, and prophane perſons, in theſe words* [That the Reconciliation and Union of hearts and affections can only with Gods bleſſing make us rejoycing in each other, and keep

our

our Enemies from rejoycing.] *And this is the earneſt expectation and hope of the Religious, and well-affected to the publick Tranquillity, That the King, our Supreme Head and Governour, whoſe gracious Diſpoſition doth not ſuffer him to cleave to any divided part of his Subjects, and to reject others that are alike Loyal, will as a Common Father, protect and cheriſh all thoſe that are found capable and worthy; and become our great Moderator by His Authority and Wiſdom, to leſſen Differences, and allay Animoſities between diſſenting brethren, which already agree in the main Points of Religion.*

Having hitherto aſſerted, that thoſe who fought under the late Kings Banner, were not His Majeſties Friends, and that thoſe that fought againſt it, ever were: he proceeds now to a Concluſion ſuitable to his premiſes, and ſtates the Intereſt of the King in favour of that Voluntary Miſtake: directing an Accord *betwixt all Reconcileable Parties*, and an Indulgence toward all thoſe that are *found Capable*, and *Worthy*. In *Both* (and in *All*) Caſes, the Presbyterian himſelf muſt be the Judge: and then we know what will become of *Royaliſts* and *Biſhops*. The Kings Friends have ever had the Honour to be Divided (by theſe People) into perſons *Popiſhly affected*, *Evil Counſellours*, and *Looſe Livers*; and it is evident, that they deſign, under theſe Limitations of *Reconcileable*, *Capable* and *Worthy*, to caſt all ſuch as Conſcienciouſly, and frankly adhere to *Monarchy*, and *Epiſcopacy*, out of the terms of their pretended Pacification. All thoſe that *They find* Capable, and Worthy, and eſteem Reconcileable, ſhall be admitted. And now the *Queſtion* is,

I. Qu. *Whether in Juſtice or Reaſon of State the* Presbyterian *Party ſhould be Rejected and Depreſſed, or Protected and Incouraged.*

It would be firſt agreed what's meant by the *Presbyterian* Party: We'll weigh the *Juſtice*, and *Reaſon* of the Propoſition afterward: his own Remark upon it is not amiſs.

As concerning their true Character, the Notation of the name whereby they are called, is both too ſhallow and too narrow for it. The word Presbyterian *hath not ſufficient depth to go to the root of the matter, nor bredth ſufficient to comprehend this ſort of men. That Form of Eccleſiaſtical Government by Parochial and Claſſical Presbyteries, Provincial and National Aſſemblies, is remote enough from their main Cauſe, and thoſe firm bonds that make them eternally one, in reſpect whereof many that approve a regulated Epiſcopacy will be found of their number,* Pag. 19.

'Tis

'Tis truly, and well ſaid. Their *Cauſe* is not the *Form*, but the *Exerciſe* of Government: for they like well enough to have that Power Themſelves, which they condemn in Others. Nor do I doubt but *many of them approve a Regulated Epiſcopacy*; that is, a *Presbytery* in a *Biſhops* ſeat, where the *Office* appears *Regulated* by the *Perſon*, as 'tis in a *Regulated Monarchy*; Where the King's ſubject to the *Law*, and the *Law* to the *two Houſes*. But I condemn not All, that wear that Character. The Wiſe, and Honeſt Few of that Denomination, who keep themſelves within the terms of Duty, and the Queſtion: Such as can talk of the Church, without diſturbing the State; and debate their private Opinions, without giving publick Scandal: For theſe, I have much Charity, and Reverence, and wiſh as great a tenderneſs toward them, as they themſelves deſire. But where I ſee a Bold Seditious Faction, biding defiance to the Civil Magiſtrate under the Churches Colours: I find not any thing ſo Sacred in the Name of *Presbyterian*, as to protect a Turbulent Party aſſuming that Appellation. It will be urg'd, that they do as little Juſtify the *Seditious*, as I condemn the *Sober Presbyterian*. But to agree that point, I'le prove, that the ſame Party, for whom they plead, and againſt whom I engage, are no leſs Enemies to the *King*, and *People*, than to *Biſhops*: and which is more; from their own practices, and poſitions; I'le make this good. Yet one would hardly gueſs this from their Character.

As concerning their main and rooted principles, Pag. 20. *They admire and Magnifie the holy Scriptures, and take them for the abſolute perfect Rule of Faith and Life, without the ſupplement of Eccleſiaſtical Traditions; yet they deny not due reſpect and reverence to venerable Antiquity. They aſſert the ſtudy and knowledge of the Scriptures to be the duty and priviledge of all Chriſtians, that according to their ſeveral capacities being skilful in the word of Righteouſneſs they may diſcern between good and evil, and being fill'd with all goodneſs may be able to exhort and admoniſh one another: Yet they acknowledge the neceſſity of a ſtanding Goſpel Miniſtry, and receive the directive authority of the Church not with implicite Faith, but the Judgment of Diſcretion: They hold the teaching of the Spirit neceſſary to the ſaving knowledge of Chriſt: Yet they do not hold that the Spirit bringeth new Revelations, but that he opens the eyes of the Underſtanding to diſcern what is of old revealed in the written Word; They exalt divine Ordinances, but debaſe humane Inventions in Gods Worſhip, particularly Ceremonies properly Religious, and of Inſtituted Myſtical Signification: Yet they allow the natural expreſſions*

of

of Reverence and Devotion, as kneeling and lifting up of the hands and eyes in Prayer; as alſo thoſe meer Circumſtances of Decency and Order, the omiſſion whereof would make the ſervice of God either undecent or leſs decent. As they worſhip God in the ſpirit according to the ſimplicity of Goſpel Inſtitutions, ſo they rejoice in Chriſt Jeſus, having no confidence in a legal Righteouſneſs, but deſire to be found in him who is made unto us Righteouſneſs by gracious Imputation: Yet withal they affirm conſtantly that good works of Piety towards God, and of Juſtice and Charity towards men are neceſſary to Salvation. Their Doctrine bears full Conformity with that of the Reformed Churches held forth in their publick Confeſſions, and particularly with that of the Church of England *in the nine and thirty Articles, only one or two paſſages* peradventure *excepted, ſo far as they may import the aſſerting of* Prelacy *and Humane Myſtical Ceremonies. They inſiſt much on the neceſſity of Regeneration, and therein lay the ground-work for the practice of Godlineſs: They preſs upon themſelves and others the ſevere exerciſe not of a of a Popiſh, outſide, formal, but a ſpiritual and real mortification, and ſelf-denial, according to the power of Chriſtianity. They are ſtrict obſervers of the Lords day, and conſtant in Family Prayer: They abſtain from Oaths, yea petty Oaths, and the irreverent uſage of Gods name in common diſcourſe; and in a word, they are ſober, juſt and circumſpect in their whole Behaviour. Such is the temper and conſtitution of this Party, which in its full latitude lies in the middle between thoſe that affect a Ceremonial Worſhip, and the height of Hierarchical Government on the one hand, and thoſe that reject an ordained Miniſtry and ſetled Church order, and regular Unity, on the other hand.*

Here is much ſaid and little prov'd; Only a Phariſaical Story, of what they are not, and what they are; that they are not as other men are, and their bare word for all. The Tale is well enough told to catch the ſilly vulgar, that look no further than Apearances: But to a ſerious Perſon, how groſs, and palpable is the Impoſture! *In the main points of Doctrine they fully agree with the nine and thirty Articles*: and 'tis but *peradventure*, that they differ, in *one, or two paſſages, ſo far as they may import the Aſſerting of Prelacy and humane Myſtical Ceremonies.* Behold the mighty Subject of an Holy War; the goodly *Idol* to which we have Sacrific'd ſo much Chriſtian Blood. Can any man imagine this the True, and Conſcientious reaſon of the Quarrel, Or that the middle way our Presbyter ſteers betwixt *Phanaticiſm*, and *Popery*, is the juſt meaſure of the Caſe? But hear him on, and he'll tell you that the Party is *Numerous* as well as *Godly*.

Within

Within these extensive limits the Presbyterian *Party contains several thousands of learned, godly orthodox Ministers, being diligent and profitable Preachers of the Word; and exemplary in their Conversation; among whom there are not a few that excell in Polemical and Practical Divinity; also of the judicious, sober, serious part of the People, (in whose affections his Majesty is most concerned) they are not the lesser number. By means of a practical Ministery this way like the Leaven in the Gospel-parable hath spread and seasoned the more consider at e nd teachable sort in all parts of the Kingdom, and especially in the more Civilized places, as Cities and Towns.* Pag. 23.

It had been well our Undertaker had put his *Orthodox, & Learned Thousands* upon the List: for that Party is a little given to false Musters. How many forg'd *Petitions* and Remonstrances what Outcries from the Press & Pulpit, in the name of the people, when yet the fortieth part of them were never privy to their own Askings? Of * ninety and seven Ministers within the Walls of *London*, fourscore and five were driven from their Churches, and Houses, at the beginning of our Troubles: and notwithstanding the monstrous Clamours which occasion'd the Conference at *Hampton Court*, in 1603. Archbishop *Spotswood* tells us, that [*of above nine thousand Ministers, but forty nine appeared upon the Roll, that stood out. and were deposed for disconformity: Such a noise will a few Disturbers cause in any Society were they are tolerated.* Hist. of the Ch. of *Scotland* Pag. 479.

* *See the History of the English and Scotch Presbyterian*, page 316.

The Presbyterians practical Ministry.

Touching his *Practical Ministry*; I'le grant the *Cause* is much beholden to the *Pulpit*, and that without the aid of seditious Lectures, I do believe the Strife had never come to Blood: But yet these Preachments did not the whole Business. Do not we know what Craft and Violence hath been used to Cheat, & Force the People; what *Protestations*, *Covenants*, and *Negative Oaths* have been Imposed, upon pain of *Imprisonment*, *Banishment*, *Sequestration*? Have not all Schools, and Nurseries of Piety and Learning been subjected to the Presbyterian mode, and many thousands of Godly, and Reverend Divines, reduced to begge their Bread because they would not *Covenant*, yet all too little to procure either a General Kindnesse, or submission to their Principles?

For the Reasons afore-going the infringement of due Liberty in these matters would perpetuate most unhappy Controversies in the Church from Age to Age. Let the Former times come in and give Evidence, As

Pag.

Pag. 25. *As touching Ceremonies, the Conteſt began early, even in King* EDWARD's *Reign, between* Hooper *and other Biſhops. The Conſecration of* Hooper *Elect Biſhop of* Gloceſter *being ſtayed, becauſe he refuſed to wear certain Garments uſed by Popiſh Biſhops, he obtained Letters from the* KING, *and from the Earl of* WARWICK, *to the Arch-Biſhop of* CANTERBURY, *and others, that he might not be burthened with certain Rites and Ceremonies, and an Oath commonly uſed in the Conſecration of Biſhops, which were offenſive to his Conſcience. Nevertheleſs he found but harſh dealing from his Fellow-Biſhops, wherof ſome were afterwards his Fellow-Martyrs, and* Ridley *among others, who afterwards thus wrote unto him, when they were both Priſoners for the Goſpel.* [" *However in time paſt in certain Circumſtances, and by* " *matters of Religion, your wiſdom, and my ſimplicity (I grant) hath a* " *little jarred, each of us following the abundance of his own ſence and* " *judgment; Now be aſſured, that even with my whole heart in the* " *Bowels of Chriſt I love you in the truth, and for the truths ſake which* " *abideth in us.*] *Some godly Martyrs in Queen* MARIES *days diſliked the Ceremonies; and none of them dyed in the defence of Ceremonies, Liturgy and Prelacy, in oppoſition to all other Eccleſiaſtical Government and Order. It was the Proteſtant verity which they witneſſed and ſealed in blood in oppoſition to Popery, eſpecially the prodigious Opinion of Tranſubſtantiation, and the Abomination of the Romiſh Maſs, or Sacrifice. In the ſame bloody days certain Engliſh Proteſtants being fled for refuge into* Germany, *and ſetled at* Frankford, *were divided amongſt themſelves about the Service-book, even with ſcandalous breach of Charity, and in the iſſue the Congregation was ſadly broken and diſſipated.*

What is intended by *due Liberty*, might be a Doubt, but the Coherence renders it, a Freedom of Acting to all intents and purpoſes at pleaſure (whether without Law, or againſt it, no matter) according to ſuch precedents of former times, as our Reſolver refers unto, and juſtifies. He tells us, *the Conteſt about Ceremonies began early*; and ſo in truth it did: For in the time of King *Edward*, this were a wambling toward the *Geneva Diſcipline*; but neither very earneſt, nor very popular: and *That* (ſo far as I can learn) procured even by the Author of that Platform, *Calvin* himſelf. Concerning *Godly Martyrs in Queen* Maries *days*; Some ſuffered that diſliked the Ceremonies: Others, that liked them. That *none died in defence of them*, is a Remarque might have been ſpared: For the Queſtion was matter of *Faith*, not

Presbyterian Liberty

Diſcipline. The *Franckford Breach* indeed was a ſad Story: but yet, conſidering the *Dividers*, of no great *Honour* or *Authority* to our Friends purpoſe. *Knox* and *Whitingham* were the prime Ring-leaders in this Diſorder, who upon ſome Diſputes ſtarted about the Service Book, joyning with others of the Conſiſtorian ſtamp, drew ſuch an extract of it, as they thought fit, and ſent it to *Calvin*, requeſting his opinion of it. Such was the Anſwer they received, as blew the whole Congregation into a flame, from whence aroſe that ſcandalous breach enſuing, *viz.* The *Engliſh Service* being eſtabliſhed, *Whittingham*, *Gilby*, *Goodman*, with ſome others, *Divided*, and went to *Geneva*, whence, both by *Letters*, and Diſcourſes they tampered the Miniſters and People of *England*, and *Scotland*, into a revolt, encouraging them to ſet up their new Diſcipline, in deſpight of all Oppoſers whatſoever.

The Goſpel returning under Queen Elizabeth, *theſe Differences were revived and held up by Diſputes, Writings, and Addreſſes, to ſeveral Parliaments and there were great thoughts of heart for theſe Diviſions*, Pag. 27.

Why this is Engliſh yet: it is but turning now to Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign to underſtand theſe People, and unriddle the *Due Liberty* they plead for. (But of This, in its proper place.) Having drawn down the Quarrel from *Edward* the Sixth, to the bleſſed Reſtauration of *Charles* the Second, (whom God protect) he proceeds to deſcant upon the Preſent.

The greateſt part of the Miniſters named Puritans *yielded Conformity to thoſe controverted Rites and Forms, that were by Law or Canons eſtabliſhed, as to things burdenſome, not deſirable; in their nature ſuppoſed indifferent, but in their uſe many ways offenſive; and groaning more and more under the yoke of bondage (as they conceived) they waited for deliverance, and were in the main, of one ſoul and ſpirit with the* Non-conformiſts. *And even then the way called* Puritaniſm *did not give but get ground. But now the Tenents of this way are rooted more than ever; and thoſe things formerly impoſed, are now by many, if not by the moſt of this way, accounted not only burdenſome, but unlawful*, Pag, 28.

The conſequents of Presbyterian Liberty.

But is it ſo, that the Matters *by Law eſtabliſhed*, in themſelves *Indifferent*, and only *Burthenſome* to *day*, (*rebus ſic ſtantibus*) may become *Unlawful* to *morrow*? By the ſame Rule Kings may be taken away as well as Biſhops; all Dignities and Powers being alike ſubmitted to a Popular Level; For if the people ſhall think fit to ſay,

ſay, the Magiſtrate is unlawful, as well as the *Ceremony*, by the ſame Reaſon he may deſtroy *One* with the *Other*; and Virtually he does it. We know the *Rites* and *Forms* of Worſhipping, are not of the *Eſſence* of Religion, and the huge buſtle about Diſcipline, is only an appeal to Ignorance, and Tumult. *The Church muſt be Reformed.* By whom? Not by the Rabble. What means this application then of ſo many factious Sermons, and Libels to the *People?* They are not Judges of the Controverſie. But in a Cauſe more capable of *Force* than *Argument*, they do well to Negotiate, where *Clamour*, and *Pretence*, weigh more than *Modeſty* and *Reaſon.* If a man asks, by what Commiſſion act theſe Zelots? They anſwer readily: *'Tis Gods Cauſe, and better obey God than Man.* He that ſaid, *Give not Credit to every Spirit*; I ſuppoſe knew as much of Gods mind, as our Illuminates. Is not miſtaken, or perverted Scripture, the ground of all *Schiſm*, and *Hereſie? Counſels may Erre*, they ſay, and cannot *Presbyterians?* How comes this Party to be more Infallible than their Neighbours? If they are not, let but all other people of Different Judgments take the ſame Freedom they do, of out-cries againſt any thing, under pretext of Conſcience; let any man imagine the confuſion. For, *where every man is his own Judge, All men ſhall Diſpute, till each Particular condemns himſelf: ſo that the Strife is Endleſs, and the Event Reſtleſneſs, and Confuſion.*

This comes of not ſubmitting to ſome Final, and Over-ruling Deciſion. Upon this pinch, at a dead lift, they fly to their *Judgment of Diſcretion:* which leaves them ſtill at Liberty to ſhape their Duty to their Profit. They tell us; *They'll be tryed by the Word of God:* not heeding, how *That* is again to be Try'd by *Them:* ſo that in Iſſue, their private interpretation of the Scriptures muſt paſs for the *Law Paramount*, to which both King and People are equally, and indiſpenſably ſubjected. Undoubtedly, what God *Commands*, we *ought* to do, and *not* to do what he *forbids.* This in few words, comprizes the Duty of Reaſonable Nature, without diſtinction either of *Offices* or *Perſons.* But theſe Inviolable *Fundamentals* apart, the *Accidents* of worſhip, the *Modes* of doing this or that; The *How*, *When*, *Where*, &c, are left various, and variable, according to the ſeveral Reſpects of *Manners*, *Times*, and *Places*; at the Diſcretion of thoſe Rulers whom God ſets over us. Where we find matters of this middle nature orderly ſetled, and diſpos'd, we are commanded *to ſubmit to theſe Humane Ordinances for the Lords ſake:* and not to Obtrude upon

the word for *Conſcience*, ſuch Diſagreements, as effectually ariſe from *Peevi∫hne∫s*, or want of due *Enquiry*. But why do I talk to thoſe that ſtop their Ears?

Their minds (ſays he) *are fix'd in this Opinion, after a long time of ſearch and practice, and are not like to be reduced to the practice of former times*, Pag. 29. This is but *Martin Junior Revived*, who ſays, *That it will be very dangerous, to our State, to maintain two contrary Factions: That the Magiſtrates are then bound, even for the quieting of our State, to put down the one: that thoſe that ſtand for the Diſcipline, neither can nor will give it over; (ſo as they will not be put down) and that the ſaid Magiſtrates cannot maintain the corruption of our Church, namely, Arch-Biſhops, and Biſhops, without the diſcontentment of their Subjects.* Will not this Argument from *Search* and *Practice*, abſolve them from Obedience to the King, as well as to the Church? Has not the *Regal Power* been ſcann'd and ſifted, as well as the *Eccleſiaſtick*: or have their *Practices* been more favourable to His Majeſty, than to the Clergy? But [*their minds are fix'd, and not to be reduced.*] This is to ſay, that if the Law and they cannot agree, they'll tug for't, upon this ſuppoſition, thus he concludes. That [*in all reaſon, the impoſing of ſuch matters of Controverſie, as by ſo many are held unlawful, and by thoſe that have a Zeal for them, judged indifferent, not neceſſary, cannot procure Peace of Church and Kingdom*, Pag. 29. I ſay on the Contrary, That the peace of Church, and Kingdom cannot be preſerved, where every Private and Licencious Spirit ſhall dare to queſtion the Authority of either. In fine, admit the Scruple truly conſciencious: It would be well yet, that ſuch as Fault the preſent Government, would Frame another, that ſhould be lyable to no exceptions, before they alter This. If that cannot be done, let us Reſt Here; for if we are bound to change till all are pleas'd, never muſt we expect to be at quiet. Some Conſciences will have no Magiſtrates at all; Others will Govern thoſe they have, or Quarrel with them. To Reconcile theſe Two in any end of Settlement, is as Impoſſible as 'tis Unſafe to put much power into the Hands of people, ſo dangerouſly principled: But to *Deſtroy* a Government, none agree better, and this we ſpeak upon Experience.

From hence, to his 40th. *Page*, I find little but Rapture, in commendation of the *Presbyterians*, with now and then a ſnap at the late *Prelates*, which is beſide my purpoſe. See now his Complement to the King.

Bleſſed

Bleſſed be God for our gracious Sovereign, who makes it his care and ſtudy to allay diſtempers, and compoſe differences by his juſt and gracious Conceſſions already publiſhed concerning Eccleſiaſtical Affairs. Pag. 40.

For fear His Majeſties Conceſſions ſhould be taken for a pure Act of *Grace*, they are epitheted, *Juſt*, as well as *Gracious*, to leſſen the *Favour*, by intimating the *Duty*: What Return gives the *Presbyterian* Party now for this Indulgence? Are they not troubleſome as ever, both in their Writings, and Contrivements? That Declaration was no ſooner publick, but a Petition was exhibited from divers Miniſters in and about *London*, for more Liberty, with ſome formalities indeed of Gratitude for That. How many bold and ſcandalous Invectives ſince that time, both from the Preſs, and Pulpit againſt the Rites of the Church, and the Epiſcopal Clergy. Nay, and againſt the Sacred Majeſty of That very Perſon, to whoſe Incomparable Clemency they owe their Heads and Fortunes: One Obſervation here; To ſhew, that only ſeverity can work upon this Faction; *The ſingle impriſonment of* Croſton *hath quieted that Party more than all the multiply'd, and tranſcendent Mercies of His Majeſty.*

That worthy Gentleman in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to the *Liturgical Conſiderator* tells us, that [*The Common-Prayer-book hath been expell'd by a Lawful Authority.*] (referring to an Ordinance of *January* 3. 1644.) If this be not *Treaſon*, then *Scot* and *Peters* were no *Traytors*, that pleaded that Authority. The *Conſiderator* further aſſures us, *Page* 34. [*That very few Chriſtians, that know the Power of Godlineſs, care for medling with the Liturgy.*] I hope His Majeſty may paſs for one of theſe *Few*.

A great Aſſertor of his Principles, is the Author of the *Covenanters Plea*, although in ſome Reſpects more plauſibly couch'd; in others Bolder; treating His Majeſty with a moſt unpardonable Inſolence, and with a ſutable regard, all his Epiſcopal Friends as they fall in his way. I ſhould exceedingly wonder how he ſcap'd a Laſh from the laſt Convention, eſpecially Dedicating that reverend Piece to the *Commons* then Aſſembled, did I not conſider, that Thoſe very Pamphlets whereof His Majeſty complains in His Declaration touching *Eccleſiaſtical Affairs*, were by my ſelf, at their firſt coming forth delivered to ſeveral Members of that Seſſion, which notwithſtanding, they were ſtill ſold in the Hall; all the Intereſt I had being too little to get them ſuppreſſed. But now return we to our Author who complains, that,

The

The Presbyterians are loaded with many Calumnies; as that they are against the Interest of Civil Magistracy, especially of Monarchy, that they are giddy, factious, schismatical, domineering, and what not? Pag. 41.

But no such matter he assures us, for *They yield unto the Supreme Magistrate a Supreme political power in all spiritual matters, but they do not yield that he is the Fountain of spiritual power, there being a spiritual power belonging to the Church, if there were no Christian Magistrate in the world. They assert only a spiritual power over the Conscience, as intrinsecally belonging to the Church; and acknowledge, that no Decree nor Canon of the Church can be a binding Law to the Subjects of any Kingdom under temporal penalties, till it be ratified by the Legislative power of that Kingdom. And they do not claim for the Convocation, or any other Ecclesiastical Convention, an Independency on Parliaments; if they did, surely the Parliament of* England *would resent such a Claim*, Pag. 42.

Neither are they *Anti-monarchical*. Pa. 44. *Did the English or Scotish Presbyters ever go about to dissolve Monarchy, and to erect some other kind of Government? In no wise: for in the solemn League and Covenant they bound themselves to endeavour the preservation of the Kings Person and Authority, and declared they had no intent to diminish His Majesties just power and greatness*, Pag. 45. How far their Principles comport with the Interest of *Civil Magistracy* or *Monarchy* shall have a place by it self: yet I might very well content my self with what arises from his own words, as they lye here before us; to Prove what he Denies: for in the same Breath he both starts the Question, and Resolves it. *Did not the English and Scotish Presbyters go about to dissolve Monarchy?* What is the Analysis of *Monarchy*, but a *Government* by a *Single Person*? (and as I take it, the Injur'd Father of our present Sovereign was That Person to whom of Right the Regal Dignity belonged.) Did not these Presbyters, he talks of, place the Supreme Power in the Two Houses, and under Their Commission seize the Kings Towns, and Forts: Levy Arms; Tax the People; Plunder, and Kill their Fellow-Subjects; Impose Oaths, Share His Majesties Revenues; Persue, and Jewishly Sell and Betray His Sacred Person? If to do all this, not only *Without*, but expresly *Against* the Kings Commission, be not *to go about to dissolve Monarchy*, I know not what is. Or if the Gentleman had rather dispute the Royal Prerogative, than confess his own Mistake in this Particular, we'll

Presbytery Antimonarchical.

we'll look a little that Way too: but I doubt the Proſpect will be none of the pleaſanteſt.

Upon the Tryal of *Cook* and *Peters*, This was Delivered for Law. *See the Narrative*, Page 182, and 183.

It is the Law of this Nation, That no One Houſe, nor Both Houſes of Parliament have any Coercive power over the King: —— That the Impriſoning of the King is Treaſon. And a little further, Thus: *The King of England is one of thoſe Princes who hath an Imperial Crown. What's That? It is not to do what he will; No, but it is that he ſhall not be puniſhed in his own Perſon, if he doth That which is in it ſelf Unlawful.*

The two Houſes have no Coercive Power over the King.

This is a ſhort, and clear Deciſion of the Caſe: nor will it ſerve his turn to argue their Integrity, from what they were bound to by their *Covenant* and *Declaration*. It matters not what they *Profeſs'd*, but what they *Did*. If this be all they have to ſay; ſome Heads are now upon the City Gates, that ſaid as much. What was the *Covenant*, but a Popular Sacrament of Religious Diſobedience, a Mark of Diſcrimination, who were againſt the King, and who were for him? And this the Marqueſs of *Montroſs* ſoon found, who being at firſt unwarily engaged in it, with the *Kirk*-party, quickly perceived his error, and retired, Living and Dying the Honour of his Nation and of the Royal Cauſe. Mark this, * **His Loyalty was charged upon him at his Death for Breach of Covenant.** ☜ The *Preſbyterian Caſuiſts* would fain perſuade the Nation to think themſelves obliged by that *Engagement*. Who *Underſtands* it firſt? (And certainly we cannot be bound to do we know not what) *Next*, 'tis Impoſſible either to *Keep*, or *Break* it: 'tis made up of ſo many Contradictions. But Once for All; there is a *Nullity* in the Inſtitution. *No man can oblige himſelf in things wherein he is ſubject, without leave from his ſuperiour: And again, The Oath of one who is under the power of Another, without the others conſent, is neither Lawful nor Obligatory.* Thus the Reverend, and Learned, *Biſhop Sanderſon*. Now to my *Preſbyterian* again.

The Covenant an Oath of Confederacy.

The Covenant neither lawful nor binding.

After

After the violent change of Government, they came ſloweſt and entred lateſt into thoſe new Engagements impoſed by the Uſurped Powers, and ſome utterly refuſed, even to the forfeiture of their preferments, and the hazard of their livelihoods, when the Nation in general ſubmit to the yoke; and many of thoſe who thus object againſt them, did in temporizing run with the foremoſt. The truth is, the generality of Conſcientious Presbyterians never ran with the current of thoſe times. Some more eminent among them, Miniſters and others, hazarded their lives, and others loſt their lives, in combining to bring our Sovereign that now is to the rightful poſſeſſion of this his Kingdom. And thoſe in Scotland *adventured no more than all to uphold him; and when he loſt the Day, they loſt their Liberty, and when he Fell, it was ſaid by the Adverſary, Presbytery was fallen,* Pag. 44.

Some honeſt Presbyterians.

Where I muſt either leave the Story foul on the Kings ſide, or prove it ſo on the Other, my choice is pardonable: but otherwiſe, I ſhall be very tender of Involving the *Honeſt Presbyterians*, with the *Guilty*. That many of them lov'd His Majeſty, and ſuffered for him, I will not queſtion; and that they all ſubmitted moſt unwillingly, to that *Violent Change* here mentioned, I do as little doubt. But I muſt needs ſay, the Action had been Nobler, and the Loyalty much Cleerer, had they conſulted the Kings ſecurity, before they loſt their own.

This does not yet oblige me to the ſame Charity for the *Scottiſh Party*; who firſt, during a Treaty with His Majeſty, baſely and brutiſhly murthered *Montroſs*, and after that, treated the King himſelf, more like a Priſoner, than a Prince.

He urges, that *The Presbyterians firſt divided, and then diſſipated the Sectarian Party, and ſo made way for His Majeſties return in Peace,* Pag. 45. *Lambert*, and his Nine Worthies, did as much. I do belive him too, *That the ſence of the Covenant quickened many mens Conſciences in their Allegiance to the King,* Pag. 46. ſo did the *Cock crowing*, mind St. *Peter* of the denial of his Maſter. *But he went out, and wept bitterly:* So does not every Body. Alas, alas, the Saints have no faults; what ſhould they weep for? *It may be peradventure ſaid, the Presbyterians would enervate Monarchy: but ſurely* (ſays our Diſcourſer) *I cannot find the riſe of this Objection, unleſs from hence, that they were not willing to come under any yoke but that of the Laws of the Realm, or to pay Arbitrary Taxes levied without conſent of Parliament.* Ibid.

From

From hence, theſe two Deductions; Firſt, that the Subject's free from that which binds the King, namely, the *Yoke of Law*. Suppoſe He breaks that Law, by what Law can we queſtion him? At beſt,'tis but to puniſh one Tranſgreſſion by Another. The *Second* Hint is Diſ-ingenuous: as if *Arbitrary Taxes* had been the ſubject of the Difference. All the world knows, before a blow was ſtrook, the King had ſtripp'd Himſelf of His *Honour*, and His *Conſcience*, to gratifie His People. But 'twas the *Government* they aim'd at; and that they fought for. Here is yet another gentle ſlipp. What are *Taxes to Presbytery*? But this is a Devil that will hardly be kept within his Circle. Juſt ſo in their Practices do they reduce all Civil Actions, under the Cognizance of their Courts of of Conſcience, as he brings here by head and ſhoulders, **Arbitrary Taxes, to Matter of Religion.**

I confeſs (ſays he Pag. 46.) *There are none that more reverence their Liberties, and value the native happineſs of the free-born Subjects of* England. *And verily their true knowledge and ſenſe of the nature of Chriſtian Religion makes a due freedom exceeding precious: For this Religion is not variable according to the will of man, but grounded upon an unchangeable and eternal truth, and doth indiſpenſibly bind every Soul high and low to one Divine Law and Rule perpetual and unalterable. And therefore doth ſtrongly plead the expedience of a due Civil Liberty on the behalf of its Profeſſors; yet ſuch a liberty as will not infeeble Monarchy, nor the legal power of the Kings of* England.

Truly I think I have not ſeen words ſo well put together that that ſignifie ſo little. *Becauſe Religion is not variable, but grounded upon an unchangeable and eternal Truth*, &c.——*Therefore the Profeſſours of it muſt have a due Civil Liberty*, &c. Is not a *Due Liberty*, *Due* to all people? Again, *What is Civil Liberty to matter of ſalvation*? And yet again. Why ſhould the Presbyterians challenge that Liberty to themſelves, which they refuſe to others, upon the very ſame Plea: and not rather ſubmit their *Diſcipline* to the *Law*, than ſtoop the *Law* to their *Diſcipline*? There is *a Liberty which is a Cloak for Maliciouſneſs*: and I am much afraid, *Theirs* and *that* are a kinn. One thing is very notable: they never ſtate what they would have, their terms are general, and indefinite, hard to be underſtood, becauſe they are reſolv'd not to be ſatisfied. *A Due Freedom, a Due Civil Liberty, The Legal Power.* What means all this, but any thing they ſhall be pleaſed to make of it?

A King ruling a free People (ſays he, *Pag.* 47.) *hath a power*

much more noble, and more free, than he that ruleth over perfect Vaſſals, that have no Propriety. The Power is more noble, becauſe it hath a more noble ſubject of Government; it is more honourable to rule Men than Beaſts, and Free men than Slaves. Likewiſe the power is more free: For whatſoever Prince hath not his power limited by his peoples legal freedom, he will be bound up ſome other way, either by the potency of ſubordinate Princes, and great Lords within the Realm, or by a veterane Army, as the Turkiſh Emperour by his Janizaries, and the Roman Cæſars *by the Pretorian Bands and the Legions. Upon which account, to be powerfull Monarch over a free people is the freedom and glory of our Sovereign Lord, above all the Potentates on earth.*

A King ruling a free people, is a Kind of *Presbyterianiſm*, and ſounds better in the mouth of a Lawyer, than of a Divine. The Correlate to *Rule*, is *Subjection*: nor will their Title to a Propriety, yet juſtify the common uſage of the Term. 'Tis of a dangerous Intimation, and ſeems to give the people more than comes to their ſhare. (I ſpeak with reverence to the Benignity of our Engliſh Laws, and the Indubitable right which every Subject hath to the Benefits thereof) *That it is more honourable to rule Free men, than Slaves*, is but a Complement. For I can make thoſe *Slaves, Free*, when I pleaſe, whereas the other way my power's confin'd; That is, in *Equity*, a Prince is bound to obſerve the *Law*, as his own Act: and if he fails, the people may compel him to it, *if* they *can ſhew a Law for't*. To end this point: What Prince ſoever ſhall ſuffer every bubling Brain to controvert the bounds of *King* and *Subject*; the *Royal Authority*, and the *Peoples Freedom*; that Prince I ſay, runs a great hazard of his Sovereignty. The very moving of the Queſtion, is to prophane the Sacredneſs of Majeſty: and by degrees begets irreverent and ſawcy habits in the People.

But Rebellion (he tells us) *and Diſobedience is the loud out-cry of ſome againſt this party. And this were a crying ſin indeed: But let not ſober minds be hurried into prejudice by ſuch exclamations and out-cries. It were to be wiſhed, for common peace and amity, that the late publick diſcords were eternally forgotten. But ſeeing ſome in theſe times of expected Reconciliation will not ceaſe to implead and condemn the honeſt minded, and render them odious to the higher powers, a neceſſity is laid upon us to ſpeak ſomething Apologetical, at leaſt to mitigate the buſineſs and remove prejudice.* Pag 48.

Sure *this loud out-cry of Rebellion, and Diſobedience*, comes from within himſelf; for truly I have a little watch'd the Preſs; and ſince

ſince his Majeſties Return, (nay a good while before) upon my Conſcience, I have not met with one ſyllable of bitterneſs againſt that party, but *Defenſive*: Yet I dare undertake to produce forty Presbyterian Pamphlets, and Diſcourſes, of freſh date, exceeding foul againſt the *King*, and his *Adherents*. It really makes me bluſh, and tremble to conſider how great a mercy they abuſe, how ſad a vengeance they provoke. Had but theſe people the leaſt ſpark of *natural Affection*, and *Remorſe*, the venerable ruins of a glorious Church and State would work upon them; Or now and then a thought how matters ſtand betwixt God and their Souls. But their great care of others, makes them neglect themſelves, and become *true Anathema's* for a *pretended publick Good*. However, they do well to cry Whore firſt; and call that a *Neceſſitated Apology*, which ſeems to me, a palpable, and cauſeleſs Slander.

Presbyterians ſeditious and impenitent.

We have heard much & often of the Presbyterians *Loyalty* and *Religion*: we'll look a little now into their *Law*; which very fairly gives us to underſtand, that the *Unbiſhoping of Timothy and Titus*, will not do their trick. They are at work already upon the two main Props of Royalty; the Kings *Negative Voice*; and the *Power of the Sword*. A bleſſed Age the while, when the *Pulpit* ſhall pretend to diſpoſe of the *Crown*, carve out the *Government*: and every ſcribling *Cloak-Divine* vent his ſeditious and crude Politiques to the People. But now it works.

The Presbyterian party in England *never engaged under a leſs Authority than that of both Houſes of Parliament. I have read that the Parliament of* England *hath ſeveral capacities, and among the reſt, theſe two; Firſt, that it repreſents the People as Subjects, and ſo it can do nothing but manifeſt their grievances, and petition for relief. Secondly, that by the conſtitution it hath part in the Sovereignty, and ſo it hath part in the Legiſlative Power, and in the final Judgment. Now when as a part of the Legiſlative Power reſides in the two Houſes, as alſo a Power to redreſs grievances, and to call into queſtion all Miniſters of State and Juſtice, and all Subjects of whatſoever degree in caſe of Delinquency, it might be thought that a part of the ſupream power doth reſide in them, though they have not the honorary Title*, Pag. 49.

Methinks we ſhould do well to leave calling the *two Houſes, the* **Parliament** *of England*, having already pay'd ſo dear for that miſtake. By the *Power of* the *Parliament* of *England*, is Intended the *King* in *Parliament*.

The two Houſes not the Parliament.

But then an *Argument* is imply'd ; neither *King*, *Lords*, nor *Commons*; nor any *two* of them, can pretend to a Parliamentary Authority, without the *Third*, This is not to ſuppoſe *Co-ordination* neither. The *Two Houſes* are ſtill *Subjects:* Their Office being only *Conſultive*, or *Preparatory*. The Character of *Power* reſts in the *Final Sanction*, and that's the Kings: So that effectually, the paſſing of a Bill, is but the *granting of a Requeſt*. So much for *Parliament*, in propriety of ſpeaking. Now to the Power of the two Houſes, (by my Antagoniſt miſ-called, *the Parliament, of England*,) upon which Bottom ſtands the Presbyterian Fabrick.

He tells us, they Act in *Two capacities*. As *Subjects, or Petitioners*, firſt: and Then, as *Sharers* of the *Sovereignty*. That is, they are ſent to *Ask* what they *Liſt*, and *Take* what they *Pleaſe*. The *Petitioning Capacity* is not for the Presbyterians purpoſe; wherefore he waves That, and ſticks to the Other. What their Power is, will beſt appear from the Kings Writ of Summons, which both *Commands* and *Limits* them, *Pro QUIBUSDAM arduis, & urgentibus negotiis*, &c. *ORDINAVIMUS* &c. He ſtates it otherwiſe, and Places *a Part of the Legiſlative Power in the Two Houſes*; which is not Doctor-like. For the *Legiſlative Power* is totally the Kings. They do but make the *Bill*, He makes the *Law*; 'Tis the *Stamp*, not the *Matter* makes it current. Nor do I comprehend what he can mean by *part of the Legiſlative power:* to my thinking, he might as well have ſaid *Part of an Indiviſible Point*. This will come to a pretty Fraction, Two Thirds of a Parliament, ſhall make Two Thirds of a Law. Is it not enough, that the King can do nothing without the Two Houſes, unleſs they may do every thing without the King? Grant this, and of all People living we are the greateſt Slaves, as of all Conſtitutions ours is the moſt Ridiculous.

The Legiſlative Power in the King.

Touching *the Power of the Two Houſes, to Redreſſe Grievances, and Queſtion all Miniſters of State and Juſtice*, The Power they have, is either from Preſcription, or Commiſſion. To the former, I think Few will pretend; and to the Latter, None. Never was the Houſe of *Commons*, at any hand reputed a Court of *Juſtice*. They cannot give an Oath, Impoſe a Fine: nor indeed exerciſe an Empire but over their own Members. 'Tis true, the *Lords* Houſe, hath in ſome Caſes a Right of Judicature; but Clayming by *Preſcription*, they are likewiſe limited by *Cuſtom*. Further;

The two Houſes no Court of Judicature

Further; *Both Houſes* are no Court of Judicature, and (with due Reverence to his Majeſty) the King himſelf in Parliament, joyn'd with the Three Eſtates, claim not a Right of Judication, but very rarely, and with great Tenderneſs. It is the proper Buſineſs of a Parliament to *make Lawes*, *Alter*, or *Repeal* them; not to *Interpret* them; unleſſe in matters of very great Importance. That's left to the Judges; and to determine of their Validity. For Acts of Parliament, either *Repugnant* in themſelves or of *impoſſible Suppoſition*; or againſt *Common-Right*, are deem'd not Binding. The Common, and moſt ſpecious ſhift of all the reſt, is, that *the Government of this Nation is in King, Lords and Commons.* This muſt be ſwallowed with great waryneſs, or 'twill choak halfe the Nation. By the KING, *Architectonicè*, and by the other TWO, *Organicè*, (as *Walker* diſtinguiſhes it) the *King*, as *the Architect*, and the *two Houſes*, as his *Inſtruments.* If there were neither *Practice*, *Law*, nor *Intereſt* in the Caſe, methinks the very oddes of Honour in the Deputation, ſhould be Enough to carry it. The *King is God's* Repreſentative; *They* are but the *Peoples.*

Say I ſhould now admit them all they challenge, (as delegated by the People) ſo tickle is the point yet, that if any one ſingle Perſon of the Number, ſhould be illegally debarr'd the Freedom of his Vote; that nicety, avoyds, and nulls the Whole Proceeding. I can hardly think any thing clearer, than the errour of placing *part of the Supream power in the two Houſes*, it implyes a Contradiction. A *part* of a Thing (with leave) *impartible.* But Drowning men will catch at Straws. However, I perceive, that his *Majeſties beſt Friends*, and the *Church's*, (as they ſtile themſelves) are reſolved to ſerve both *King* and *Biſhops* alike. That is, juſt as the Biſhop is to rule in *Conſociation* with his Presbyters, ſo ſhall his Majeſty with his *Fellow Princes*, the Preſbyterian Members. It cannot but exceedingly diſpoſe the King to grant Theſe People all DUE LIBERTY, that will give Him ſo much. Crowns are but Troubleſome; and Government ſits heavy upon the Shoulders of a Single Perſon; They'll eaſe him of that Care, and Weight: and for the *honor of their Prince and their Countries good*, divide the Glorious Load, among themſelves. *This being paſt*, (which Heaven avert) *we may* (ſayes the Late King, *Exact Coll.* 316) *be wayted on Bare headed, we may have our Hand kiſs'd, the Style of Majeſty continued to us, and the Kings Authority, declared by both*

Presbyters ſerve King and Biſhops alike

both Houſes of Parliament, may be ſtill the ſtile of your Commands; we may have Swords, and Maces carryed before us, & pleaſe our Self with ſight of a Crown and Scepter ———But ſee how the Man relents; and tells us, (though the Law ſayes the King can do no wrong, *that This part of the Supreme power, is indeed capable of doing wrong, yet how it might be Guilty of Rebellion, is more difficult to conceive.* Pag. 49.

Put caſe the two Houſes ſhould take up Arms againſt the King, beauſe he will not Baniſh the one half of his Friends, and hang up the reſt: would not that be Rebellion? I could ſtart twenty Suppoſitions more; but I'll ſtop here: and the rather, becauſe our Author profeſſes, that [*in this high and tender point it belongs not to him to Determine.*] Yet he goes on, and certainly believes that the World is divided into *Fools* and *Presbyterians*; he would not otherwiſe have thruſt upon us ſo groſs a Juggle, as that which I am now about to examine.

Touching the much debated point (ſays he, *Pag.* 50.) *of reſiſting the Higher Powers, without paſſing any Judgement in the great Caſe of* England, *I ſhall only make rehearſal of the words of* Grotius *a man of renown; and known to be neither Antimonarchical, nor Antiprelatical, which are found in his Book* De Jure Belli & Pacis, *by himſelf dedicated to the French King.* Si Rex partem habeat ſummi Imperii, partem alteram Populus aut Senatus, Regi in partem non ſuam involanti, vis juſta opponi poterit, quia eatenus Imperium non habet. Quod locum habere cenſeo, etiamſi dictum ſit, Belli poteſtatem penes Regem fore. Id enim de Bello externo intelligendum eſt, cum alioqui quiſquis Imperii ſummi partem habeat, non poſſit non jus habere eam partem tuendi. *lib.* 1. *c.* 4. *ſ.* 13.

Presbyterians Loyalty.

Here we find *Grotius* cited, to juſtifie that the Lords and Commons may make War againſt the King to defend their Title to the Supream Power. *Pythagoras his Opinion concerning Wild Fowl*, had been as much to the purpoſe. For the Engliſh Readers ſake, I'll *turn* it; and in this point deſire a more than ordinary attention. *Where the Supremacy is in the King, in ſome Caſes; and in Others, in the People, or Senate. That King invading the Others Right, may be lawfully reſiſted; for his Power reaches not ſo far. And this I think will ſtand good, although I have already placed the right of making War, in the King; for that muſt be underſtood of a Foreign War: Since whoſoever hath a part of the Supream Power, hath conſequently a right of maintaining*

maintaining ſuch part as he hath. There is one line yet remaining, which our Author hath very prudently kept for a Reſerve, till the Presbyterians ſhall have gotten the better of the King. *Quod ubi fit, poteſt Rex etiam ſuam, Imperii partem belli jure amittere.* That is, *Where thus it happens the Kings encroachment upon the Peoples Right, may fairly amount to a forfeiture of his own.* Is it not pity that people of theſe mild, and complying principles, ſhould be charg'd with *Diſobedience?* If this be the Caſe of *England*, the Queſtion is no longer, the *Presbyterians Liberty*, but the *Kings Title* to his *Crown*.

That Chapter of *Grotius*, whence he takes his Quotation, treats *De Bello Subditorum, in Superiores; Where, and where not, Subjects may take up Arms againſt their Superiours.* This learned man, among other Caſes, tells us, in this they may, and the Reaſon is evident: For where the Sovereignty is thus diſpoſed; half to the King, half to the people, that Prince is but a *Subject* to ſome purpoſes, a *King* to others. So that in any point of Sovereignty, formally veſted in the people; He is not their Superiour, but they his. How finely he hath match'd the Caſe of *England*, where Kings have no Reſtraint, but what they put upon themſelves? for the Laws are their proper Acts. But mark the Proceſſe of his Reaſonings: and how (in his own Phraſe) *he feels his way ſtep by ſtep.* [*The Presbyterians were ever in the right*] he ſays. Why, if he would be quiet, who ſays the contrary? But then the King was in the wrong. To bring the Caſe up to *Grotius* his determination: we muſt admit; *Firſt*, that by the conſtitution of *England*, the Sovereignty is ſhared betwixt the King and the two Houſes: and *Next*, that the late King did Actually invade the Popular Prerogative: from whence ariſes the lawfullneſs of reſiſtance; and after that, *Poteſt Rex etiam ſuam Imperii partem Belli jure amittere.* They have at laſt the ſame right to the Crown, they had at firſt to the Quarrel. He that peruſes the firſt eight Sections of the forementioned Chapter, will find *Grotius* no favourer of his opinions that quotes him. Be the Prince what he will, he tells us, *Summum Imperium tenentibus reſiſti jure non poſſe.* *Bodin* yet more expreſſely, that *England and Scotland are abſolute Monarchies.* That the *Supream Power* is only in the *King.* (*Jura Majeſtatis, ac Imperii ſummam, in unius Principis, Arbitrio verſari.* Further, *In Senatu nullum eſt Imperium*; Nor only ſo; but whoever

Bodin *de Rep.* lib. 2. cap. 5.

De Repub. lib. 1. cap. 8. Lib. 3. cap 1. Ibid.

urges

urges the contrary, meditates a Commotion. *Iſti qui Imperium Senatui tribuunt, Reipublicæ interitum, ac ſtatus everſionem moliuntur.*

As to the point of Loyalty now in queſtion, the ſubverſion of the Fundamental Government of this Kingdom could not be effected, till thoſe Members of Parliament that were Presbyterian *were many of them Impriſoned, others forcibly ſecluded by the violence of the Army, and the reſt thereupon withdrew from the Houſe of Commons*, Pag. 51.

Then it ſeems till that Violence by the Army, upon the Preſbyterians, there was none Acted by the Presbyterians upon the King. *To ſeize his Towns and Magazines; Hunt, and Aſſault His Royal Perſon; Part His Revenues; Hang up His Friends:* All this is Juſtify'd, in Caſe His Majeſty refuſes to be rul'd by His Two Houſes. Alas, the *Fundamental Government* was ſafe, (I warrant ye) ſo long as the Rights of Sovereignty were exercis'd, firſt by the Aſſembly in *Scotland*, and then by a pack'd Party, in a Cloſe Committee: And the Presbyterians nevertheleſs Honeſt men for ſelling the King firſt; Then voting him a Priſoner; and after that, for Pinching him even upon the very point of Presbytery. Surely they are much to blame that charge theſe Innocents with Diſloyalty.

If the *Presbyterian Members had not been Forced* (they ſay) *All had been well.* Truly it may be ſo; yet if I miſtake not, there was a time when the *Epiſcopal Members* were Forced too: and had that Violence been ſpared, it had never come to This. But I ſuppoſe, the *City-tumults* againſt BISHOPS: the Outcryes of the *Rabble* at *White-hall*: the *Multitudes* that Bawl'd for *Reformation*: Poſting up ſuch and ſuch for *Staffordians*, as honeſtly oppoſed the Torrent of the People. This in the *Well-affected*, paſſes for *Chriſtian Liberty.* But our *Divine Machiavel* follows his Opinion with a Proof.

For they (ſays he, meaning the Presbyterians) *had Voted the Kings Conceſſions a Ground ſufficient for the Houſes to proceed to ſettle the Nation, and were willing to caſt whatever they Contended for, upon a Legal Security*, Pag. 51.

Waving their Former Vote of *Non-Addreſſes*, and that foul *Declaration* of their Reaſons for it: We will in Charity believe, they were over-awd, and that it was extorted by the Army. But what excuſe for the matter of the *Propoſitions?* That they were Actuated by a *Presbyterian Spirit*, appears in This, that ey demanded Settlement of a *Presbyterian Government.* It remains

mains now only from Hence to gather the Fair Equivalence, of this Gentleman's Doctrine, and to diſcover what 'tis the Presbyterian Faction calls a *Legal Security*.

They hold, that if the King of *England* will not comply with the Two Houſes, the People may *Chaſe*, *Sequeſter*, and *Impriſon* him: and when they have him in Diſtreſs, they may without Diſloyalty preſs him to theſe, or the like Conditions for his Liberty.

Presbyterian Poſitions.

Firſt, *By a Publick Act to juſtifie that Violence, and condemn himſelf.*

2ly. *To Renounce and Aboliſh Epiſcopacy, although bound by Oath and Judgment to defend it.*

3ly. *To transfer the Right of Levying Men, and Monies, to the Two Houſes; by them to be Raiſed and Diſpoſed of at Pleaſure, without rendring any Accompt to His Majeſty.*

4ly. *To deliver up the Lives, Liberties, and Fortunes of all that ſerved Him, to the Mercy of That Party.*

5ly. *To grant that all Offices of Truſt may be diſpoſed of by the Appointment of Both Houſes.*

This is a ſhort, and modeſt Accompt of *Presbyterian Loyalty*, the *Due Liberty* they contend for: which being ſetled upon a *Legal Security*, with ſuch further *Conceſſions*, as their Modeſty ſhall vouchſafe to require, puts an end to the Diſpute. His late Majeſty obſerves (*upon* Uxbridge *Treaty*) That *it was a grand Maxime with them, always to ask ſomthing, which in Reaſon, and Honour muſt be denied, that they might have ſome colour to refuſe all that was in other things granted.* So we find it. But what's the Reaſon of this peeviſhneſs?

Is there any thing in the Nature of Prelacy *that frames the mind to Obedience and Loyalty? Or is there any thing in Presbytery, that inclines to Rebellion and Diſobedience?* Pag. 52. Truly I think there is. Prelacy holds a better proportion in the Scale of Order, as a more Regular Subordination of Duties and Relations. Nature and Providence do not move by Leaps, but by Inſenſible and Soft Degrees, which give Stability and Beauty to the Univerſe. Is not the World compos'd of Diſagreements, Hot and Cold, Heavy and Light? And yet we ſee thoſe Oppoſiti-

Prelacy a more orderly Conſtitution than Presbytery.

ons are by the means of middle, and Conciliating mixtures wrought into a Compliance? 'Tis the ſame Caſe in *Subject* and *Superiour*. *Higher* and *Lower*, betwixt *Top* and *Bottom*, are but as ſeveral Links of one Providential Chain, where every Individual, by vertue of this mutual Dependency contributes to the Peace, and Benefit of the Whole: ſome are below *Me*: and This ſweetens the Thought that I am below *Others*: By which Libration are prevented thoſe Diſtempers which ariſe either from the Affectation of more Power, or the Shame of having none at all. As theſe *Degrees* of *Mean*, and *Noble*, are beyond doubt of Abſolute neceſſity, to Political Concord; ſo poſſibly the Cloſer the Remove, The better yet, as to the point of Social Expedience; provided, that the Diſtances be ſuch as to avoid Confuſion, and preſerve Diſtinct Offices, and Powers from enterfering. Nor is this Gradual methodonly ſuted to Humane Intereſt, as being moſt accommodate to Publick Quiet, and to defend the Sacredneſs of Majeſty from Popular Diſtempers: but 'tis the very Rule which God himſelf Impoſes upon the whole Creation: *making of the ſame Lump, one Veſſel to Honor, and another to diſhonor*, Rom. 9. 21. Subjecting by the Law of his own Will, *This* to *That*: *That*, to what's next *above* it: *Both* to a *further* Power, *All* to *Himſelf*. And here we Reſt: as at the Fountain of Authority. From *God*, *Kings* Reign; They appoint their *Subſtitutes*, and ſo on, to inferiour Delegations; *All Powers derive from a Divine Original*.

This Orderly Gradation, which we find in Prelacy muſt needs beget a Reverence to Authority; the Hierarchy it ſelf depending upon a Principle of Obedience, whereas our Utopian Presbytery advances it ſelf upon a Level of Confuſion. It is a kind of Negative Faction, united to diſſolve a laudable and ſetled frame of Government, that they may afterward ſet up they know not what. We may have learn'd thus much from late and ſad experience: let him that would know more of it, read *the Survey of pretended Holy Diſcipline*. I think it would be hard to ſhew one eminent Presbyterian, that ſtickles not for an Ariſtocracy in the *State*, as well as in the *Church*: and he that ſaid *No Biſhop, No King*, gave a ſhrewd Judgment; not as implying a Princes abſolute dependence upon Biſhops, but in effect, the King's Authority is wounded through the Church; the Reformation of what is amiſs, belonging to the *Ruler*, not to the *People*. I do not yet condemn all *Presbyters*, nor juſtify all *Prelates*.

We

We are told, *that in ancient times*, and for a *ſeries of many ages, the Kings of* England *have had tedious conflicts with Prelates, in their Dominions*, Pag. 53. 'Tis right, and the ſame cauſe is now eſpouſed by our more than Papal Presbyterians; to wit, Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction over the Civil Power. But, we are further Queſtion'd.

If Presbytery *and Rebellion be connatural, how comes it to paſs, that thoſe States or Kingdoms where it hath been eſtabliſhed or tolerated, have for any time been free from broyls and commotions?* Pag. 53. It is as true that thoſe places have been quieteſt, where Presbytery hath gain'd footing, as 'tis, *that Presbyterians have never diſclaim'd, or abandon'd their Lawful Prince: that they have never ceaſed to ſollicite, and ſupplicate his Regards, and Favour, even when Their power hath been at the higheſt, and His ſunk loweſt.* Ibid.

This is ſomething which in good manners wants a name. How far the Presbyterians have *Abondon'd* their Prince, I ſhall not preſs, but rather refer the Reader to examine how far, and in what manner they have *Sollicited* him. (*Cujus contrarium.*)

His late Majeſty, after forty Meſſages for *Peace*, and a *Perſonal Treaty*, finding himſelf moſt barbarouſly laid aſide; in a *Declaration from Carisbrook Caſtle*, Dated *Janu.* 18. 1647. Expoſtulates the mattter in theſe Terms.

Now would I know, what it is that is deſired: Is it Peace? I have ſhewed the way (being both willing and deſirous to perform my part in it) which is, a juſt Compliance with all chief Intereſts. Is it Plenty and Happineſs? They are the inſeparable effects of Peace; Is it Security? *I, who wiſh that all Men would forgive and forget like me, have offer'd the Militia for my time. Is it* Liberty of Conſcience? *He who wants it, is moſt ready to give it. Is it the right* Adminiſtration of Juſtice? *Officers of truſt are committed to the choice of my two Houſes of Parliament. Is it* frequent Parliaments? *I have legally, fully concurr'd therewith. Is it the* Arriers of the Army? *Upon ſettlement, they will certainly be paid, with much eaſe; but before, there will be found much difficulty, if not impoſſibility in it.*

Reliquiæ ſacræ Carolinæ. Pag. 158.

Thus all the World cannot but ſee my real and unwearied endeavours for Peace, *the which (by the grace of God) I*

ſhall neither repent me of, nor ever be ſlackened in: Notwithſtanding my paſt, preſent, or future ſufferings; But, if I may not be heard, let every one judge, who it is that obſtructs, the Good I would do, or might do.

Where the right lies, a *Presbyterian* may better *Determine*, than a *Royaliſt Queſtion.*

——*Magno ſe judice quiſque tuetur.*

Here's the Teſtimony of a *Pedant* in Ballance againſt the Authority of a Prince.

He tells us, by and by, that *Prophaneneſs, Intemperance, Revellings, Outrages, and filthy Lewdneſs were not at any time in the memory of the preſent Age, held under more Reſtraint, than in the late diſtracted times, by means of a Practical Miniſtry*, Pag. 55.

Theſe Generals ſpell nothing, and to name Particulars were not ſo candid; I could elſe make up *Scot* and *Peters*, at leaſt a ſcore, even out of the ſelect Tribe of the Reformers: (and theſe I think are not as yet Canonized for Saints.)

'Tis no Prophaneſs (is it?) to play the Hocus Pocus in a Pulpit, with Rings, and Bodkins; to talk Treaſon by Inſpiration; and entitle the Holy Ghoſt to Murther and Rebellion. To appoint Mock Faſts, and thank God for Victories he never gave them. To ſwear for, and againſt the King, in the ſame breath; to convert Churches into Stables, and for fear of Superſtition, to commit Sacriledge.

Nor is it Out-rage ſure, or Intemperance, to ſeize the Patrimony of the Church, the Kings Revenues; Pillage and Kill their Fellow Subjects. To ſet up Ordinances againſt ſetled Laws, and ſubject the Ten Commandments to the ſuperiour Vote of a Committee. To juſtify Tumults againſt Authority, and ſuffer the moſt damnable Hereſies to ſcape without reproof. But what if there were Diſorders; by whom were they Cauſed?

It is moſt unreaſonable to object, that the late wild poſtures, extravagancies and incongruities in Government, were the work of Presbytery *or* Presbyterians. *The Nation had never proof of* Presbytery, *for it was never ſetled, but rather decryed and expoſed to prejudice by thoſe that were in ſway, and that in the more early times of the late Wars.* Pag. 59.

I muſt confeſs indeed, that *Presbytery* was never ſetled, nor ever likely to be, ſo much did the whole Nation ſtomach it;

But

But yet how this agrees with his former Reaſoning, *Pag.* 29. I do not underſtand. There, he pretends, that *by long practice mens minds are fix'd in this opinion*: and that the party is *numerous*. Here he contents himſelf to acknowledge, that the Presbyterians loſt their power early, and that they never recovered it ſince. This will not ſerve his turn, to acquit the Faction (ſo denominated) of our late Miſeries. Our Sovereign (of bleſſed memory) brings the conteſt down, *to his ſurprizal at* Holmby, *and the Diſtractions in the two Houſes, the Army, and the City, enſuing upon it. Theſe* (ſays that excellent Prince) *are but the ſtruglings of thoſe Twins, which lately one Womb encloſed, the Younger ſtriving to prevail againſt the Elder* *what the Presbyterians have hunted after, the Independents now ſeek to catch for themſelves.* In fine; One finiſh'd what the Other began; for the King dyed at laſt, but of thoſe wounds which he at firſt received in his Authority. His Majeſty upon his leaving *Oxford*, and going to the *Scots*, clears this yet further: where he calls it, *Adventuring upon their Loyalty, who firſt began his Troubles.*

The truth of this matter (ſays he, Pag. 58.) *is cleared by a paſſage of our late Sovereign, in a Letter to His Majeſty that now is.* [*All the leſſer Factions were at firſt officious Servants to Presbytery their great Maſter, till time and Military Succeſs diſcovering to each their particular advantages, invited them to part ſtakes, and leaving the joynt ſtock of uniform Religion, pretended each to drive for their Party the Trade of profits and preferments, to the breaking and undoing not only of the Church and State, but of Presbytery it ſelf.*—(It follows) * **which ſeem'd, and hoped at firſt to have engroſſed all.** *Note.

The laſt line is as true as any of the reſt; but all truths are not to be ſpoken. Indeed this Slip is ſomewhat with the groſſeſt. Not to trouble my ſelf with their formal Fopperies, of *Deacons*, *Elders*, and their *Pariſh-meetings*; Thoſe are but popular amuſements: We'll paſs to what's more pertinent, and ſee how he acquits his Friends of joyning with the Independents. *The truth is* (ſays he, Pag. 60.) *Sectarianiſm grew up in a Myſtery of Iniquity and State-policy, and it was not well diſcerned, till it became almoſt triumphant by Military ſucceſſes.*

'Tis

'Tis a ſtrange thing the Presbyterians ſhould not ſee what they they themſelves contrived; what all others took notice of; and what the late King offer'd to prove [*In his Declaration of the* 12th. 1642.] The Inſolence of Sectaries being not only wink'd at, but publickly avow'd; and the Law thwarted to protect them. See what one ſays, (no ſtranger to their Practices) to prove, and evidence the Combination.

Exact Collections. Pag. 531.

The Leading-men, *or* Grandees *firſt divided themſelves into two* Factions, *or* Juntoes; Presbyterians, *and* Independents: *ſeeming to look only at the* Church, *but they involv'd the Intereſts of the* Common-wealth. —*Theſe having* ſeemingly divided themſelves, *and having* really divided the Houſes, *and captivated their Reſpective Parties Iudgment*; ——*Teaching them by an implicite Faith,* Jurare in verba Magiſtri, *To pin their Opinions upon their ſleeves: they begin to advance their projects of monopolizing the Profits, Preferments, and Power, of the Kingdom in themſelves. To which purpoſe, though the Leaders of each Party ſeem to maintain a hot oppoſition, yet when any profit or preferment is to be reached at, it is obſerved that a powerful Independent eſpecially, moves for a leading Preſbyterian, or a leading Presbyterian for an Independent: and ſeldom doth one oppoſe or ſpeak againſt another, in ſuch Caſes, unleſs ſomewhat of particular Spleen or Competition come between: which cauſeth them to break the Common-rule. By this means the Grandees of each Faction, ſeldom miſs their Mark, ſince an Independent moving for a Presbyterian, his Reputation carries the Buſineſs clear with the Independent Party: and the Presbyterians will not oppoſe a Leading man of their own ſide.*

Hiſtory of Independency. Page 1. Page 2.

I find we are not like to Agree, for theſe People cannot ſee their own Faults, nor we their Virtues. I would take a good Journey to meet any man ſtiff in that Way, that would but Confeſs he was ever in any Error.

Of all the prejudices and ſcandals taken againſt this way, (ſays he, Pag. 63.) *there is none greater than this, that it is repreſented as tyrannical and domineering, and that thoſe who live under it, muſt* (like Iſſachar) *crouch under the Burdens.*

We do indeed accompt the Presbyterian Diſcipline very Tyrannical, and by and by we'll give our Reaſons for it. Not *becauſe this Diſcipline cenſures Scandalous Diſorders,* (as he inſinuates) but for that it ſubjects all Civil matters to a Conſiſtorian Cognizance, and rapt by an Impulſe of Paſſion, calls many things

Scandalous

Scandalous, which meaſured by the Rule of Piety, and Reaſon, are found Praiſe-worthy, and of laudable Example. The uſage of the Common-Prayer-book, is to *Them*, *Scandalous*, though ſetled by the Law: but to eject a Miniſter for Reading it, though both Without Law, and Againſt it; That, *They* eſteem *no Scandal*; *We*, *the contrary*.

I have now brought the Gentleman to his firſt Stage, where I might very fairly leave him, for having already done my *Buſineſs*, what I do more, is but for *Company*. So far as I can judge, I have not ſcap'd one ſyllable material to his purpoſe: nor have I either Broken his Periods, or unlink'd his Reaſonings, to puzzle, or avoid his meaning. How fairly I have dealt with what I have expoſed, whether in matter of *Fact*, *Deduction*, or *Good manners*; (the Subject of the Difference duly weighed) That I ſubmit to the Reader, and where the Reaſon lies betwixt us.

I have indeed omitted a great part of the Debate, as not at all related to my Deſign, nor (to ſpeak freely) much to the point in Queſtion. His frequent and Rhetorical Raptures, extolling to the Heavens, the *Wiſdom* and *Sanctity* of the *Presbyterians*; (but above all, the *Legions* of the Saints) what does this florid Vanity ſignifie more than the putting of his own Name to a fair Picture, when yet, *for* ought *he proves*, and for ought *we diſcern*, there's not one Line betwixt them of Agreement. The contrary Courſe he takes with the *Prelatick Party*. They (forſooth) are *Not* ſo and ſo: and from his *Generals*, There he is pleaſed to enter into *prohibited Particulars*, taxing in *ſpecial* manner the exceſſes of ſome of our Late Prelates: but without any inſtances of Good in the Other Party, which does but ſpitefully and weakly imply, that *Biſhops* have more *Faults*, than Presbyterians have Virtues. It will not be now expected, that we that *differ* in the *Premiſes*, ſhould *agree* in the *Concluſion*. But for That we'll take our Fortunes.

Upon the whole matter aforegoing, we firmly build this Poſition, P. 65. *That the Presbyterian Party ought not in Juſtice or Reaſon of State to be rejected and depreſſed, but ought to be protected and encouraged.* This is but one Doctors Opinion; *we* think *otherwiſe*; *Nevertheleſs* (ſays he) *there being a ſeeming complication in this buſineſs, and an other ample Party appearing in competition, a difficulty remains, and the matter falls into a further deliberation. And thereupon we are fallen upon the ſecond main Enquiry.* Pag. 66.

II. Qu. *Whether the Presbyterian Party may be protected and encouraged, and the Epiſcopal not deſerted or diſobliged.*

'Tis a Particular Grace, that the *Biſhops* Party may yet be admitted into the Competition, and that the man of the *ſhort Robe* will vouchſafe to Enquire into the *Conſiſtence of Epiſcopacy* and *Presbytery*: yet it was boldy ventur'd to Determine what *ought* to be done, before he had examin'd, whether the Thing was *Feaſible* or no. I ſhall not ſpend my Time to Controvert *Ideas*, and Wrangle about Governments in the Air: we are for Plain and Practicable Contrivements, ſuch as, *Authority*, *Good Order*, and *Long Experience* have recommended to us.

I ſuppoſe the agreeing of *Both Parties* in ſuch *Middle Terms* as he propoſes, a thing not utterly Impoſſible. Many things may be fair enough in *Notion*, yet of exceeding hazzard to be put in *Practice*; eſpecially 'tis dangerous to try Tricks with Politique Conſtitutions. Great Alterations, are ſcarce ſafe, even where they are *Lawful*, and wrought with *good Intention*; Much leſs are thoſe ſo, which are promoted by a Diſorderly, and Popular Earneſtneſs, and with *ſeditious Meaning*. For This I dare lay down as a *Poſition*: *Never did any Private Party hand againſt a Publick Settlement, with an Intent to Mend it.*

But what have we to do with the Imaginary *Colation* of the two Church-parties; when the Kirk-Diſcipline affronts the Civil Sanction, and Actually invades the King's Authority? Let them firſt bring their Principles to their Duties, Treating like Subjects, and Submitting as Chriſtians. Can any man believe thoſe People Friends to the Church, that are Enemies to the State? or that the God of Order can be pleaſed with the Promoters of Confuſion.

Were there no other Reaſon to deny the thing they ask, than their bare manner of Asking; it ought not to be Granted. What ſignifies their Talk of *Number*, *Power*, *Reſolution*, *but a* Falſe Muſter of the Faction, to make a Party with the Rabble? (when yet, God knows they're Inconſiderable: let every man but overlook his Neighbour, and Count, he'll find the Diſproportion.) Undoubtedly the moſt Inſufferable of all their Arguments is that of *Danger*; there's but one ſtep between that Word

Word and Violence. First, it implyes a Seditious Complication. They move for ſuch as they believe will Tumult: if not, where lyes the Hazzard? Beſide; Thoſe Subjects that dare tell their Prince, 'tis *dangerous* to deny their Askings; do by that Inſolence render his Conceſſions much more *hazzardous*. Perſons of that Audacious temper, will hardly make a ſober uſe of an extorted Bounty.

So far as *Presbyterian*, and *Epiſcopal*, purely refer to the *Church*, I ſhall not much concern my ſelf in Our Reſolvers *Second main Enquiry*: (Equal to all the World is the Incomparable *Hooker*, upon that Subject) but where theſe Terms are in a greater Latitude, applied to Civil matters, I ſhall be bold to paſs ſome further Obſervations.

The Diſſenting ſide oppoſe not all Liturgy, but deſire that the preſent orm may be Changed, or Reformed. Pag. 70.

That's but a Modeſt Motion. But now ſuppoſe, his *Majeſty*, the *Law*, and Forty for One of the Nation, ſhould deſire the Continuance of it as it is: what Equity have the Diſſenters to the Change, or what would be the Benefit, if granted? Not the Tenth part, even of the Presbyterians, would be contented with it. Some of them are againſt all ſet Forms of Common-Prayer whatever; Others (more moderate forſooth) do not oppoſe a *Preſcript Form*, ſo it be not *enjoyn'd*. A Third ſort, will vouchſafe to permit the *Engliſh Liturgy*, provided they may have the purging of it themſelves; and when all's done the Sectaries may claim as much right to *aboliſh* That, as they to *alter* This. And now for Ceremonies.

They oppoſe not any circumſtance of Decency and Order, but deſire that myſtical Ceremonies of Humane inſtitution may be aboliſhed, or not injoyned. Ibid.

First, the Diſſenters are not the Judges of *Decency* and *Order*; and for *Myſtical Ceremonies of Humane inſtitution*; (as *Scaliger* ſays of the *Sepia*) *Caliginem effundit, & evadit*; he troubles the Water and eſcapes in the Dark.

Multiformity in Religion (ſays our Reconciler; pleading for Accomodation, *Pag.* 73.) *publickly profeſſed doth not well comport with the ſpirit of this Nation, which is free, eager, jealous, apt to animoſities and jealouſies, beſides that it hath ever had a ſtrong propenſion to Uniformity.*

Had this fallen from a Common Pen, I could have better born the Diſproportion of his Character of the Engliſh Temper,

—— *Free*, *Eager*, *Jealous*, and yet propence to *Uniformity*. This ſeems to me a mixture Incompoſſible. But the good man means well, and writes ſo, when he liſts. His drift is, to perſwade us, that to comply with the *Presbytery*, is to comport with the *ſpirit of this Nation*: which being *Free*, and *Eager*, ſeems to Cry, *Beware*. How bleſſedly would theſe *Free-ſpirited* Worthies order their Subjects if they were once in Power, that thus preſume from their own Level, to Menace, and Controll Authority!

If *Toleration* might compoſe the Difference, there were ſome hope, but That, alas, is more than they can afford the *Government*, and much leſs will they accept it for *themſelves*. *The temper of this Kingdom* (ſays he) *does not well accord with extremes on either hand*, Pag. 74. and to ſee the Fortune of it, the Presbyterians are juſt in the *Middle*.

Toleration being not the Daughter of Amity but of Enmity (at leaſt) in ſome degree ſuppoſeth the Party tolerated to be a burden, eſpecially if conceived dangerous to the way eſtabliſhed: and commonly holds no longer than meer neceſſity compels; and conſequently neither party take themſelves to be ſafe, the one alwaies fearing to loſe its authority, and the other its liberty. Pag. 74.

Behold a *learned* Expoſtulation, and a *Dutifull*. *Where the party tolerated appears dangerous to the way eſtabliſhed: the One fears to loſe its Authority, and the Other its Liberty.* There's no great depth in the diſcovery that from an Opinion of *mutual Danger* ariſes *mutual Jealouſie*. But what's this Caſe to the Subject of our Debate? *Toleration.* By Toleration, is not meant an Imprudential Yielding, to an Untractable, and Churliſh Faction: but a Diſcreet, and Pious Application of Tenderneſs toward ſuch as by their Fair Comportment in the Mayn of Order, and good Manners, appear to merit it. True it is, God himſelf is the only Searcher of Hearts, who ſees our Thoughts, even in the bed of their Conception. Yet where we find an Inconformity of Practiſe to Profeſſion: People *that ſtreyn at a Gnat, and ſwallow a Camel*, We may without offence to Charity rank thoſe Incongruous Chriſtians among *Hypocrites*: and with great Juſtice hold them to the Law, that ſtrive to bring the Law down to their humours. By the ſame Rule ought we to judge in favour of their Scruples, whoſe Lives are ſquar'd by a conform ſeverity and ſtrictneſs.

It

It is moſt true that *ſuch Propoſals may ſuffice for Peace, which will not ſatisfie Humour and Faction, and Carnal Intereſt.* Pag. 76. Why do we not apply our ſelves then to the only Umpire of the Controverſie; the Setled Law, which, without either Paſſion, or Deſign, lays down our Duty, and our Intereſt? Theſe wranglings about Trifles do but enflame the Difference, and ſtart new Animoſities, inſtead of Quieting the Old. The great pretence of Scandal (forſooth) is this.

The Presbyterians ſtick at Ceremonies properly ſacred, and ſignificant by humane inſtitution, which they conceive to be more than mere circumſtances, even parts of Worſhip; and whatſoever inſtituted Worſhip is not ordained of God, they hold unlawfull. Pag. 84.

This Paſſage lyes a little out of my Rode, but however, I'll make it my way. It is much eaſier to *call* our Ceremonies *ſacred* and *parts of worſhip*, than to *prove* them ſo. Is the *manner* of Doing any thing, part of the thing Done? And for *Significant by Humane Inſtitution* the Exception is as Frivolous. Becauſe that in *ſome* Caſes even of External Diſcipline, the Church is *limited*; does it therefore follow that it is *free* in none? or ty'd up only to ſuch Rites, and Ceremonies, as hold no ſignal proportion with the Reaſon of their Inſtitution? This Argument cuts their own Throats, ſince by the ſignificancy of the *Sitting Poſture* at the Communion, they maintain the Uſe of it; for (ſay their *Admonitioners*) *It* BETOKENS *Reſt, and full Accompliſhment of Legal Ceremonies in Chriſt.*

They that ſcruple our myſtical ſignificant Ceremonies, conceive that they are properly and meerly ſacred; as having the honour of God for their direct and immediate end. Pag. 86.

Theſe Reaſonings are but *Snares* for *Woodcocks*. That the *ultimate* end of all our Actions is, (or at leaſt ought to be) *the Honour of God*, admits no Queſtion; but 'tis not therefore the *Immediate end* of every thing we doe, nor in particular of *Ceremonies*. The Outward Forms and Rites of Publick Worſhip, direct partly to *Uniformity* and *Order*; and partly to excite due *Reverence* and *Affection* in the diſcharge of holy Duties, by ſenſible Actions, and remarkable Circumſtances. But he purſues his Errour; and Inſtances, *That the Surplice is not for gravity, nor merely for decent diſtinction; but a religious myſtical habit, the Character or Badge of a ſacred Office, or Service; conformable to the linnen Ephod under the Law.* Ibid.

Significant Ceremonies not ſacred.

The grand Exception againſt the Surplice is matter of Scandal, and that amounts to nothing where People will be peeviſh, and carp at every thing. Allow it what Original he pleaſes: If it be neither Unlawfull in it Self: nor wickedly applied; and by Authority thought fit to be Impoſed; why ſhould it not be uſed? What ſayes the Incomparable *Hooker*, in this point? *To ſolemn actions of Royalty, and State, their ſuitable Ornaments are a Beauty; are they only in Religion a ſtain?* And in another place. *The names of our Months, and of our Days, we are not ignorant from whence they came, and with what diſhonour unto God they are ſaid to have been deviſed at the firſt. What could be ſpoken againſt any thing more effectual to ſtir hatred, than that which ſometimes the Ancient Fathers in this caſe ſpeak? Yet thoſe very names are at this day in uſe throughout Chriſtendom, without hurt or ſcandal to any. Clear and manifeſt it is, that things deviſed by Hereticks, yea, deviſed of a very Heretical Purpoſe, even againſt Religion, and at their firſt deviſing worthy to have been withſtood, may in time grow meet to be kept; as that cuſtom, the Inventers whereof were the* * Eunomian Hereticks. *So that Cuſtom once eſtabliſhed, and confirmed by uſe, being preſently without harm, are not in regard of their corrupt original, to be held ſcandalous. But concerning thoſe Ceremonies, which they reckon for moſt Popiſh, they are not able to avouch that any of them was otherwiſe inſtituted, than unto good; yea, ſo uſed at the firſt.*

Eccleſiaſt. Polity, Lib. 5. Sect. 29.

Ec. Polity. lib. 4. Sect. 12.

* The *Eunomian* Hereticks in diſhonour of the bleſſed Trinity, brought in the laying on of water but once, to croſſe the cuſtom of the Church, which in Baptiſme did it thrice.

The ſigning with the ſign of the Croſs (they conceive) is more evidently ſacred than the former. As Baptiſm conſecrates the Child, ſo doth the Croſs; it is uſed as a ſealing ſign of our Obligation to Chriſt, as the words uſed in the application thereof do manifeſt; and the Book of Canons doth declare expreſly, which ſaith That it is an honourable badge, whereby the Infant is dedicated to the ſervice of him that dyed on the Croſs, as by the words uſed in the Book of Common Prayer it may appear: *And therefore it is in that reſpect Sacramental.* Pag. 87.

'Tis well a nurtur'd Child, that gives his Mother the Lye: and it is little better, to charge this ſenſe upon the Church of *England*; when by the very Letter of the Canon, an expreſs care is taken to prevent all poſſibility of exception, by a clear explication of

of the Churches Judgment in that particular. The Juggle is ſo groſs, I need but cite the Canon to confute it.

Firſt, The Church of England *ſince the aboliſhing of Popery, hath ever held and taught, and ſo doth hold and teach ſtill, that the ſign of the Croſs uſed in Baptiſm, is no part of the ſubſtance of that Sacrament; for when the Miniſter dipping the Infant in Water, or laying Water upon the Face of it (as the manner alſo is) hath pronounced theſe words;* I Baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, *the Infant is fully, and perfectly Baptized. So as the ſign of the Croſs being afterwards uſed, doth neither add any thing to the vertue or perfection of Baptiſm; nor being omitted, doth detract any thing from the effect and ſubſtance of it.*

Secondly, it is apparent in the Communion Book, that the Infant baptized, is by vertue of Baptiſm, before it be ſigned with the ſign of the Croſs, received into the Congregation of Chriſts Flock, as a perfect Member thereof, and not by any power aſcribed unto the ſign of the Croſs; ſo that for the very remembrance of the Croſs, which is very precious to all them that rightly believe in Jeſus Chriſt, and in the other reſpects mentioned. The Church of England *hath retained ſtill the ſign of it in Baptiſm, following therein the Primitive and Apoſtolical Churches; and accounting it a lawful outward Ceremony, and honourable badge, whereby the Infant is dedicated to the ſervice of him that died upon the Croſs, as by the words uſed in the Book of Common Prayer it may appear.* Canon 30.

If this will not ſuffice to prove that nothing *Sacramental* is intended by it; let it be noted, that in *Private Baptiſm the Croſs is totally omitted.*

His next exception is at *Holy dayes*: I But ſhall paſs my bounds too far. I'll borrow one Maxime of the judicious *Hooker* upon that Subject, which ſhall ſerve for all. *Thoſe things which the Law of God leaveth arbitrary, and at Liberty, are all ſubject unto poſitive Laws of men: which Laws, for the Common benefit, abridge particular mens liberty in ſuch things, as far as the rules of equity will ſuffer.* Eccleſ. Polity, *Lib* 5. *Sect* 71.

After the *Quality* of our Ceremonies, the holy man will have one fling at the *Number* of them.

If the Engliſh *Ceremonies be warrantably uſed, what hinders the uſe of divers other Ceremonies uſed in the Roman Church? Is it ſaid their multitude will become burthenſom and inconvenient? But who can determine the convenient number? And however, an exchange of one Ceremony for another were not unlawfull. For what reaſon may not*

ſome

ſome other Romiſh rites in Baptiſm be uſed as well as the Croſs, ſeeing they are nothing leſs ſignificant or inoffenſive; nay, peradventure much more inoffenſive, becauſe the Papiſts by giving divine Worſhip to the Croſs have abuſed it to groſſe Idolatry. Pag. 88.

Beggars muſt be no chuſers: Muſt we uſe all, or none? The Engliſh Church hath made Election of the Engliſh Ceremonies; *What*, and how *many*: being the proper Judge both in the point of *Number*, and *Convenience*. 'Tis not for us to Queſtion the Authority, but to obey it. *What if the Croſs hath been abuſed?* So hath the *Knee* been bent; the *Hands* and *Eyes* addreſs'd to an Idol. Are we, becauſe of this miſapplication, prohibited to worſhip the true God, in the ſame manner, and poſture? Now to the *Liturgy* again.

The Presbyterians are not ſatisfied in the preſent Liturgy, but deſire it may be laid aſide, or much Reformed. And what ſolid reaſon withſtands the Equity of this Deſire? Pag. 90.

This ſolid reaſon does withſtand it. They beg like ſturdy Cripples, for *Chriſt's ſake*, with a Cudgel. And 'tis not ſafe for *Authority* to give ground to a *Faction*.

Whoſoever obſerves impartially, ſhall find that Political Prudence was joyned with the Chriſtian Piety in compoſing the Engliſh Service-Book. Pag. 91.

And the ſame *Prudence* is now joyn'd with the ſame *Piety*, both in the Right, and Intereſt of preſerving it. His next grief is a heavy one.

Canonical ſubſcription lately impoſ'd, is a yoke of Bondage, (Now mark him) *to be conſidered by all thoſe that have a true regard to ſuch Liberty in Religion, as equity and neceſſity pleads for.* Pag. 94. Either this paſſage is *ſeditious*, and to enflame the people againſt Authority, or I am no *Engliſhman*.

The Canon (ſays he, Pag. 95.) *requires a ſubſcribing to the thirty nine Articles; to the Common-Prayer Book; to the Book of ordering Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons; that all theſe contain in them nothing contrary to the Word of God.* Canon 36. *This is* unreaſonable, unprofitable, and unneceſſary. Nay, let us take in the third Article too.—To wit, *That the nine and thirty Articles are agreeable to the word of God.* And now the Form of *ſubſcription*, viz. *I do willingly, and* ex animo, *ſubſcribe to theſe three Articles above mentioned, and to all things that are contained in them.*

This is *the Yoke of Bondage*, which our Reverend Libertine complains of. Firſt, to the *unreaſonableneſs* of this ſubſcription.

Touching

Touching the *King's Supremacy*, aſſerted in the firſt Article, he is ſilent; and I ſuppoſe he would be thought conſenting. As to the reſt, what *Reaſon* is there that any man ſhould be admitted into the *Miniſtry*, without ſubſcribing to the Conſtitution of that Church, into which he ſeeks admittance?

Canonical ſubſcription defended.

If he cannot ſubſcribe in *Conſcience*, he cannot be admitted in *Prudence*: and if he refuſes in point of Stomack, that man is not of a Goſpel-temper. In fine, he that holds a fair opinion of the *Doctrine*, and *Diſcipline*, of the Church of *England*, may very *reaſonable* ſet his hand to his opinion: and he that does not, may as *reaſonably* be rejected, becauſe of ſuch diſagreements. So much for *unreaſonable*; Neither is it *unprofitable*: for ſuch as have any ſpark either of Honour, or Shame, will in regard to ſuch a Teſtimony, be tender of giving themſelves the Lye, whatſoever they would do otherwiſe.

His third Cavil is, that it is *unneceſſary*; (ſo are his exceptions.) Let any man conſider, when all theſe Bars and Limits are too little to reſtrain turbulent and ſacrilegious ſpirits from dangerous and irreverent attemps: what Seas of *Schiſm* and *Hereſy* would break it upon us, were but theſe Banks demoliſh'd. But he hath found out an expedient, how *Unity in Doctrine, and Unformity in Practice, may be as well attain'd and far more kindly, without this enforced ſubſcription*: (that is) *If no Miniſter be ſuffered to Preach, or Write any thing contrary to the eſtabliſhed Doctrine, Worſhip or Diſcipline, nor ordinarily for the main to neglect the eſtabliſhed Rule.* Pag. 97.

This laſt paſſage appears to me moſt ſpitefully pleaſant, *Not ordinarily for the main*: that is Always ſometimes, *he would neglect the eſtabliſhed Rule.*

If the Laws already in force againſt *Revolters*, had been duly executed, 'tis likely *the Intereſt of* England, *in the matter of Religion* had not been now the Queſtion. But ſtill this ſuppoſition does not imply an abſolute ſufficiency of that ſtrickneſs to all intents and purpoſes of Order, and Argreement. 'Tis what we *think*, not what we *ſay*; the Harmony of *Souls*, more than of *Forms*, which God regards: without that ſacred, and entire conſent of Judgment, and Affections, the reſt is but a flat and cold Formality.

Not

Not to Act contrary to preſcribed Rules, (where we are bound up by a Penalty) is but a Negative, and Paſſive Obedience; a complyance rather with Convenience, than Duty, unleſs joyn'd with a prone, and full aſſent, both to the Truth, and Equity of thoſe determinations. For this and many reaſons more, *Canonical ſubſcription* ſeems to me exceeding neceſſary. But for thoſe People to decline it, (upon pretence forſooth of Conſcience) that upon pain of Freedom, and Eſtate, nay, and of Hell it ſelf, enforced the *Covenant*, is moſt unequal.

The late Kings Declaration concerning Scotland, *pag.* 403.

A Presbyterian Preacher, * *refuſed to Pray for Sir* William Nesbett, *late Provoſt of* Edenburgh, *when he was lying upon his Death-bed, only becauſe he had not ſubſcribed the Covenant.* Let me be Pardoned, if I underſtand not this incongruous Holineſs.

As for the Decrees and Canons of the Church, what rightful Authority doth make them, as the Law of the Medes *and* Perſians *that altereth not?* Pag. 101.

Surely he over-ſhoots himſelf. *What rightful Authority?* The Kings: and by a leſs Authority they cannot be diſcharged. By that *Authority*, that Licenſes * the *Excommunication of the Impugners of the Rites and Ceremonies eſtabliſhed in the Church of England:* — the Oppoſers alſo of the * Government, by *Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops*, &c. — By *that Authority*, to which this Gentleman hath forfeited the Head he wears. Well, but he tells us,

* *Canon* 6.

* *Canon* 7.

The Publick ſtate of theſe Differences is ſuch, that the Prelatiſt may, and ought to deſcend to the Presbyterians, in the propoſed moderate way; but the Presbyterians cannot come up to the Prelatiſts in the heighth of their way, Pag. 97.

With the Kings leave, had been good Manners yet. By what Authority, does Presbytery pretend to unſeat the Hierarchy? All the World knows, (as much as they know any thing of that Antiquity) that Biſhops are of Apoſtolical Extraction: and we are not to Imagine, that They died inteſtate, and their Commiſſion with them. But Biſhops have *deſcended* already, and what was the event of it? Truly it was as moderate an Epiſcopacy as Heart could wiſh: But, as I remember, their Revenues were not employed to maintain a Practical Miniſtry. The Rule is, *Si vis an velim, effice ut poſſim nolle.* But ſee the moderation of the Man.

Some change (he ſays) *in the outward Form, and Ceremonies, which are but a Garb, or Dreſs, is no Real change of the Worſhip.* Pag. 103.

I thought

I thought we had differ'd upon point of *Conſcience*, about *Ceremonies proper ſacred*, Pag. 84. *and parts of Worſhip.* But now it ſeems 'tis but the *Garbe*, or *Dreſs* we ſtick at. The good man has forgotten himſelf; And yet we had beſt be wary, for 'tis but an Untoward hint he gives us. *Oftentimes* (ſays he) *moderate Reformations do prevent Abolitions, and Extirpations*, Pag. 103.

They do ſo, often; and ſometimes they cauſe them: that is; Be the State never ſo diſtemper'd, where Subjects turn Reformers, the Remedy is worſe than the Diſeaſe. In fine, when I look back, I find the very ſame deſires of Reformation originally pretended; which (after ſuch deſcentions as never any Prince before the bleſſed Father of our Gracious Sovereign, made to his Subjects) proceeded yet to utter *extirpation*, *Root*, and *Branch*.

The preſent face of things looks ſo like Twenty years ago, I cannot chuſe but fear the ſame Deſign from the ſame Method; the ſame Effects from the ſame Cauſes. *Is not that likely to be a bleſſed Reformation, where Faction dictates, and Tumults execute:* But our *Pacifick Moderator* is of another Temper ſure; he only adviſes a Yielding, for fear of worſe: eſpecially conſidering,

That the Party called Presbyterian may be Protected, and Encouraged, and the Epiſcopal not Deſerted nor Diſobliged, Page 111. (Which is his Reſolution *upon the Second Quære.*)

Presbyterian Improvements, are Commonly a little *Seniſter*; (or as a man may ſay, *over the left Shoulder*) They have away to themſelves, of making *a Glorious King, and a Happy People.* But we ſhall not diſpute the *Poſſibility* of doing many things which may be yet of dangerous Experiment. I do belive it poſſible for a man to *flye*; yet ſet him upon *Pauls*, and Lure him down, upon the Tryal, 'tis at leaſt Six to Four he breaks his Neck. Truly in my Opinion this Propoſal is all out as Impracticable. But 'tis all one to Me. What if the Two Church-Parties, can Agree, or what if they cannot. My buſineſs is to keep the Presbyterian from laying Violent hands upon the *Civil Power*, and to convince a Party ſo denominated, of *Sedition*, not of *Schiſm.* His Third Enquiry follows.

Qu. III. *Whether the upholding of both Parties by a juſt and equal Accomodation, be not in it ſelf more deſireable, and more agreeable to the State of* England, *than the abſolute exalting of one Party, and the total ſubverſion of the other?* Pag. 111. (And thus he Reaſons.)

That ſtate of Prelacy which cannot ſtand without the ſubverſion of the Presbyterians, and that ſtands in oppoſition to regulated Epiſcopacy, will become a myſtery of a meer carnal and worldly ſtate, under a ſacred title and venerable name of our Mother the Church. For in ſuch oppoſition, of what will it be made up, but of Lordly Revenue, Dignity, Splendor, and Juriſdiction, with outward eaſe and pleaſure? What will its deſign be from age to age, but to uphold and advance its own pomp and potency? Read the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories, and you ſhall find the great buſineſs of the Hierarchy hath been to conteſt with Princes and Nobles, and all ranks and degrees, about their Immunities, Priviledges, Preheminencies, to multiply Conſtitutions and Ceremonies for props to their own Greatneſs, but not to promote the Spiritual Kingdom of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt in the hearts of People, according to the life and power of Chriſtianity.

Let this ſerve for a taſte of his Pedantique Boldneſs. Whether the *Scandal*, or the *Danger* of theſe *Liberties* is the Greater, may be One Queſtion: and whether the Uſurper of this Freedom is the better *Subject*, or *Chriſtian*, may be another. If we reſpect the holy *Order* of *Biſhops*, together with the Sacred Authority of *Law*, by which they are here eſtabliſh'd, how *ſcandalous* and irreverend is this Invective? Or if the unſetled humour of the People; how *Dangerous?* if we reflect either upon *Chriſtian Unity*, or *Political Obedience*; how inconſiſtent is this manner of proceeding with what we owe to God, and the King?

That State of Prelacy, which cannot ſtand without the ſubverſion of the Presbyterians, &c. ——'Tis very well;——And why the ſubverſion of the Presbyterians? How thoſe that never were *Up*, ſhould be thrown *Down*, I cannot imagine. By what *Law*, or by what *Equity*, do theſe People pretend to any Intereſt of Eſtabliſhment in *England*? Thoſe of the Presbyterian Judgment, that out of a real tenderneſs cannot comply in all particulars, will beyond doubt receive from His Majeſty ſuch Favour, and Indulgence, as may abundantly ſuffice to their relief. But that pre-

tence

tence doth not one jot entitle them to challenge a further Influence upon the Government. Theſe wayward appetites and Cravings, are but the ſickly Longings of a peeviſh Woman. A kind of voluntary and priviledg'd Conſcience they have, which if it happens to take a fancy even to the *Crown*; *Monarchy* it ſelf, muſt rather periſh, than theſe poor Wretches loſe their *Longing*. Soberly, I would adviſe them by any means, to wave theſe troubleſom and groundleſs pretences: It ſtarts a ſcurvy Queſtion, and makes the People ask, *how they came by the right they challenge?*

A voluntary Conſcience.

For the reſt, Epiſcopacy is like to be well ordered, when the Presbyterians have the Regulation of it. There have been great conteſts (no queſtion) mov'd by the *Hierarchy*; but I ſuppoſe this Gentleman will not inſtance in many, ſince the Reformation, derogatory to the Jurisdiction Royal. Whereas the whole Courſe of the Presbyterian Diſcipline hath been Tumultuous; and their avowed Principles are more deſtructive to Royalty, than even the Rankeſt of the Jeſuites themſelves.

Having at length Talk'd his Fill againſt the Pomp of *Prelacy*; and Charged the arrogance of *Presbyters* upon the *Biſhops*: Thus he Concludes,

In very deed, the State here deſcribed, will never ſtand ſafely among a People that are Free, Serious, Searching, and diſſeeming in matter of Religion, Pag. 114. Which to the *Many*, ſounds thus much. *This is the Pride, and Tyranny of Biſhops; and none but a Slaviſh and Beſotted People will endure it.* He that makes other of it, forces it. Having by the Spirit of Natural Divination foretold the effects which He Himſelf intends to Cauſe; he gives this Hint to the Vulgar, That *a Hierarchy of this Nature hath a ſtrong bias toward Popery.* Ibid. No doubt, and ſo had *Monarchy*. Was not this Imputation by the ſame Party, caſt upon the late King, and with the ſame meaſure of Confidence, and Bitterneſs? When yet we know that thoſe that charged him with it, did not believe themſelves; it was ſo rank, and evident a Calumny. Not to inſiſt upon the Dying Teſtimony of that Incomparable Prince, (which was but ſutable to the Pious Practice and Profeſſion of of his whole Life) That early *Proteſtation of His Majeſty, before His receiving of the Holy Euchariſt at* Chriſt-Church *in* Oxon, 1643 will be more pertinent to my purpoſe.

Bibliotheca Regia, *p.* 58.

His Majeſty being to receive the Sacrament from the hands of the Lord Arch-Biſhop of Armagh, *uſed theſe publick Expreſſions immediately before His receiving the Bleſſed Elements: He roſe up from His Knees, and beckning to the Arch-Biſhop for a ſhort forbearance, made this* Proteſtation.

MY LORD,

His Majeſties Proteſtation.

I eſpy here are many reſolved Proteſtants, who may declare to the World the Reſolution I now do make. I have to the Utmoſt of my power prepared My Soul to become a worthy Receiver; and may I ſo receive Comfort by the Bleſſed Sacrament, as I do intend the Eſtabliſhment of the True Reformed Proteſtant Religion, as it ſtood in its Beauty in the happy days of Queen Elizabeth, *without any Connivence at Popery. I bleſs God, that in the midſt of theſe publick Diſtractions, I have ſtill Liberty to Communicate; and may this Sacrament be My Damnation, if My* Heart *do not joyn with My* Lips *in this* Proteſtation.

This was not yet enough to allay the clamour, till with His Royal Blood he had Seal'd this Proteſtation. If the objecter can produce a fouler injury either to *Religion*, *Duty*, *Truth*, *Honour*, or *Humanity*, let it be done to ſave the credit of the Faction, unleſs they reckon the ſuperlative perfection of their Wickedneſs, a point of Glory.

His next remark is not amiſs. *Let it be well obſerv'd, that the deſigns of ſuppreſſing Puritans, and complying with Papiſts, had their beginning both at once, and proceeded in equal paces.* Pag. 115.

Let it be here as well obſerv'd that if by *Puritans* be meant thoſe of the Separation, by *Papiſts* is intended ſuch as kept their Stations: Theſe Revolters eſteeming as Anti-Chriſtian, whatever ſtands in oppoſition to their heady purpoſes. We have this both from Story and Experience, that it hath been the conſtant practice of theſe unmannerly *Apoſtates, to ſpeak evil of Dignities*; and being fall'n off themſelves, it is but carnal prudence, by damning of the *Authority* to juſtify the *Schiſm*. No wonder then *if the deſigns of ſuppreſſing Puritans, and complying with Papiſts, had* (in his ſence) *the ſame beginning, and proceeded in equal paces.*

To

To bring himſelf off, he ſhifts it thus, Pag. 116. *According to a vulgar ſenſe, we take Popery in the height thereof, for the* Hereſies *and* Idolatries; *and in the lower degree thereof, for the groſs* Errors *and* Superſtitions *of the Church of* Rome; and 'tis againſt Engliſh Popery in the *lower degree*, that he plants his battery: arguing ſo formally againſt our going over to *Rome*, that any Stranger to the Story would ſwear, The *Prelates* and the *Pope* were more than half agreed already.

Having at length with great good-will adviſed the Church of *England* as to the Main, he concludes, that *All approaches and motions towards* Rome *are dangerous*, Pag. 120.

But are not all receſſes from Truth, more dangerous? Becauſe in *every* thing we cannot agree with them, muſt we in *nothing*? To me this appears rather Petulancy, than Pious Reaſon. We are to hold faſt the Truth, wherever it lies: and to embrace what's good, and laudable in any Church, without adhering to the contrary. Did not St. *Paul become all things to all men, that by all means he might gain ſome*?

But *if we walk upon the Brink* (he tells us, Pag. 120.) *we may ſoon fall into the Pit.*) Theſe wary men forget, that there's a *Gulf* on the one hand, as well as a *Pit* on the other: and that the *narrow way* is that which leads to Eternal Happineſs.

But as to Reaſon of State (he ſays that) *enmity with* Rome *hath been reputed the Stability of* England; *concerning which the Duke of* Rhoan *hath delivered this Maxime*; [*That beſides the Intereſt which the King of* England *hath common with all Princes, he hath yet one particular, which is, that he ought throughly to acquire the advancement of the Proteſtant Religion, even with as much zeal as the King of* Spain *appears Protector of the Catholick.* ibid.]

Allow this Maxime good in State, he hath but found a Rod to whip himſelf. *The King of* England *ought to advance the* Proteſtant *Religion.* Content. What now if theſe Diſciplinarians prove no Proteſtants? But rather a *Schiſmatical*, and dividing Party, driving an Intereſt of their own, under that ſpecious name; and with great ſhew of Holineſs, oppoſing not only the Practices and Rules of the *Reformed Churches*, but even the Fundamentals of *Chriſtianity* it ſelf? By whom will they be tried? or on what Judgment, and Authority will they reſt? They Quarrel with the *Order* of *Biſhops*; the *Common-Prayer*; the *Rites* and *Ceremonies* of the *Church*; the *Law* of the Land; with *Cuſtoms*, and

Engliſh and *Scotch* Presbyterians no Proteſtants.

and *Antiquity*: In ſhort, with every thing but the *Geneva-Diſcipline*. They do by *That* too, as our Gallants do by *French Faſhions*. The Court of *France* being the Standard of quaint *Mode* and *Dreſs*, to the *one*; as is *Geneva*, of *Church-Order* to the *other*. What is *there* uſed, though in it ſelf extravagant enough, our humour is to over-do; and if the *French* wear but wide *Breeches*, we forſooth muſt wear *Petticoats*. Conſult the Learned, and moſt Eminent Aſſertors of their *Diſcipline*; ask the grand Architect Himſelf, or indeed, any of His *Sectatours*, (of fair and honorable credit) concerning the Subject of our preſent Controverſie. And,

I. *Whether it be a* Proteſtant *Opinion, that the* Hierarchy *is* Antichriſtian?

II. *Whether ſuch Laws of Humane Inſtitution, as neither contradict the* General Laws of Nature, nor any Poſitive Law in Scripture, be binding or no?

III. *In caſe of Male-Adminiſtration, either in Church, or State: Whither the People may take upon them to Reform?*

But this they are not ſo ſtiff it, as to maintain it, but by blind inferences not worth regard.

This is the ſtate of our diſpute; and if in theſe particulars our *Anti-Prelatiſts* oppoſe the current of Reformed Divines: to advance their Intereſt, is to undermine the common Intereſt of the *King*, *Nation* and the *Proteſtant* Cauſe. Needs muſt it move many *Revolts*, and keep off many *Proſelites*, to ſee ſuch Principles declared of the Eſſence of *Chriſtian Religion*, as a good honeſt *Pagan* would be aſhamed of. Nor leſs repugnant are they to Rules of *Society*, than of *Conſcience*; *No Tyranny ſo cruel, and Imperious*; *no Slavery ſo reproachful*. Set up their *Diſcipline*, and we're at *School* again. Methinks I ſee a *Presbyter* with his *Rod* over every *Pariſh*; and the whole Nation turning up their Tails to a pack of *Pedants*. Yet hateful as it is, *even that* it ſelf, eſtabliſh'd by Authority, might challenge our Obedience. I have digreſs'd too far; yet in convenient place I muſt ſay ſomething further upon this Subject.

If our new fangled *Politician* had conſider'd, that the *King*'s Intereſt leads him to ſupport, that which the *Presbyterians* ſtrive to *overthrow*, (the Proteſtant Religion) I am perſuaded he would have ſpared the Duke of *Rhoan* in this particular. The *Maxime* even as it lies before us, affording matter of dangerous deduction

deduction to his diſadvantage: but taken in *Coherence*, nothing can be more ſharp and poſitive againſt him.

That great and wiſe Captain the Duke of *Rhoan* diſcourſing upon what reaſons of State, Queen *Elizabeth* acted toward *Spain*, *France*, and the United *Provinces*; tells us particularly, how much ſhe favoured the *Proteſtants* in *France*, and *Germany*. [*Par toutes ces maximes*, (dit il) *cette ſage Princeſſe a bien fait comprendre, à ſes ſucceſſeurs, que outre l' intereſt que l' Angleterre a commun avec tous les Princes*, &c. — 'By all theſe Maximes (*ſays he*) this wiſe Prin-'ceſs hath given her Succeſſors to underſtand, that beſides the 'Intereſt which *England* hath *common* with other Princes; yet one '*particular* it hath, which is to advance the Proteſtant Religion 'with the ſame Zeal, the King of *Spain* does the Catholick.

L' Intereſt des Princes Diſcours. 7.

Be it here noted, that when the Queen was moſt concern'd, and buſie to promote the Proteſtant Cauſe, even at that very time was She as much employ'd to cruſh the *Presbyterian* Faction, *viz. Cartwright*, *Coppinger*, *Arthington*, *Hacket*, and their Confederates. The *First* of theſe was Impriſon'd, and fined for Seditious, and Schiſmatical practices againſt the *Church* and *State*. The *Second* ſtarved himſelf in a Goal; The *Third* repented, and publickly recanted; The *Fourth* was put to Death for horrid Blaſphemies. (Theſe People talk'd of a practical Miniſtry too.) The *Men* are gone, but their *Poſitions* are ſtill in being, and only attend a bleſſed opportunity to be put in Execution. This may appear from diverſe late diſcourſes, which are effectually no other than *Cartwright's Principles*, and *Model*, couch'd in warier terms, and other Authority than theſe, or ſuch as theſe, I think the very Authors of them will ſcarce pretend to.

Puritan Proteſtants.

One Obſervation more. Our *Paraphraſe* renders *the advancement of the Proteſtant Religion*, — Enmity with *Rome*, to the great ſcandal of the Reform'd Profeſſion. We have no *Enmity* but with *Error*, which in a rigid *Puritan*, to us, is the ſame thing as in a *Papiſt*.

But *Popery* (he tells us,) *hath been ever infamous for Excommunicating, Murthering, and Depoſing Princes.*

I am no Advocate for the *Roman* Cauſe, but upon this account, I think betwixt the *Jeſuite*, and the *Puritan*, it may be a drawn Battle. And yet he follows, with an aſſurance that *the Proteſtant Religion aims at nothing, but that the Kings Prerogative, and Popular*

pular Liberty, may be ever Ballanced. Pag. 121. (That is, the *Puritans* the *Presbyterian Religion*, as he explains himſelf a little lower.)

I cannot call to mind one ſingle paſſage in this whole Diſcourſe, concerning the *King's Power*, or the *Peoples Liberty*; which is not either worded Doubtfully, or with ſome popular Limitation upon the Royal Authority. What does he mean by *even Ballanced? Cheek by Joul?* Or by what warrant from the Word of God, does a Presbyters Religion intermeddle with Popular Liberty? Unleſs the holy Man intends to bring *Homage* to *Kings*, within the compaſs of *Ceremonies of Humane, and Myſtical Inſtitution.* Yet once again.

The Presbyterians Principle (he ſays) *is for ſubjection to Princes, though they were Hereticks, or Infidels; and if they differ herein from the Prelatical Proteſtants,* (I was afraid we had been all Papiſts) it is only *that they plead for Liberty, ſetled by known Laws, and Fundamental Conſtitutions.* Pag. 122.

Still *ad Populum?* Theſe are the Incantations which have bewitch'd this Nation. This Charm of *Qualify'd Diſloyalty*, and *Conditional Obedience.* Behold the very Soul of the Faction in in theſe five lines; a fair profeſſion firſt to His *Majeſty*, and with the ſame breath a Seditious hint to the *People.* What is that Liberty he talks of, but a more colourable title to a Tumult? That Legal Freedom, to which both by the Royal Bounty, and our own Birth-right we ſtand entituled, we ought not to conteſt for our Sovereign, and (God be prais'd) we need not. Now for another fit of kindneſs.

His Majeſty our Native King, may govern as he pleaſes, without fear of Hazzards, by continuing to ſhew himſelf a common Father. *Pag.* 123.

What's this Clauſe a kin to the third Article of the Covenant? *To preſerve and defend the King's Majeſties Perſon, and Authority,* in the preſervation and defence of the true Religion, and Liberties of the Kingdoms, (as who ſhould ſay, if he does otherwiſe, let him look to himſelf.)

The exceſſive dominion of the Hierarchy, with the rigorous impoſition of humane Ceremonies, was accounted much of the malady of former times, which ended in thoſe deadly Convulſions of Church and State. Ibid.

Since this Pragmatical *Levite* will provoke a Controverſie, I am content to entertain it.

If

If the Biſhops exceſſes were the Cauſe of the War, how came the Kings ruine to be the event of it? But 'tis no new thing for a Presbyterian to ſaddle the wrong Horſe. Juſt in this manner did the Covenanters treat His late Majeſty: and *by thoſe very Troops that cry'd down Biſhops was the King murther'd.* Ridiculous Brutes, to boggle at a Surplice, aad yet run head-long into a Rebellion.

The grand ſource of our Miſeries was the *Covenant*, by which as by a Spell (in the Name of the Bleſſed Trinity) the People were inſenſibly bewitched into an aptneſs to work any Wickedneſs which the Interpreters of that Oracle ſhould ſay was the Intendment of it.

The firſt notorious Rupture was in *Scotland*, in 1637. uſher'd in by a COVENANT, which without Queſtion was formally agreed upon by the confederate Faction of both Kingdoms, as the moſt proper, and leaſt hazzardous way of taſting the Kings Patience, and the Peoples humours. That their Deſign was laid, and carried on by Counſels, and Intelligence, as aforeſaid, may be collected from the Conſequent, and Brotherly Agreements: and truly the Retroſpect of the Act of *Indemnity* ſeems to hint no leſs, for it commences from the firſt Scotiſh Broyls, tho four or five years before the War broke out in *England*; what was begun by *Covenant*, was ſo proſecuted.

By vertue of the Covenant, the Kirk-party ſupply'd themſelves with Men and Monies: Armies were brought into the Field; and beyond doubt, many that truly loved the King, not knowing what they did, engaged againſt him. To keep up this Deluſion, the Preſs and Pulpit did their parts, and to deal freely, after this advance, I ſhould as much have wondred if they had ſtop'd ſhort of his Death, as I find Others wondering how they durſt accompliſh it. Death with a *Bullet* or an *Axe*, is the ſame *Miſchief* to him that ſuffers it: and the ſame *Crime*; wilfully done, in thoſe that *Act* it. No man can Rationally *allow One*, and *condemn* the *Other*: For, if the Violence be Lawful; why not as well as in the Field, upon a Scaffold?

In this particular, the Doctor is beſide his Cuſhion. He makes me think of the Marqueſs of *Newcaſtle*, upon a ſawcy Clergyman. Why ſhould I remember that he's a Prieſt, (ſays my Lord) if he forgets it himſelf? His next argument againſt *Prelacy* is a Modeſt, and (as I take it,) a queynt One.

Can the ſelf ſame State, (ſays he) *and Frame of Eccleſiaſticks be now revived after ſo great and long continued alterations, by which the Anti-prelatical Party is exceedingly increaſed and ſtrengthened?* Pag. 124.

Cannot *Prelacy* be better *Reſtored* after a *Diſcontinuance*, than *Presbytery erected*, where it never had a *Being*. The very Laws are yet to make for the One, and ſtill in force for the Other. But the great Obſtacle is, *the Anti-prelatical party is exceedingly encreaſed, and ſtrengthened.* Truly I think, if His Majeſty ſhould leſſen the Number of them, by two or three of the Promoters of that Doctrine, the Preſident might do ſome good upon the reſt. Can any thing be more ſeditious? Theſe hints upon fair grounds, and given in *Private*, might very well become the gravity of a Church-man, or the Profeſſion of a Loyal Subject. But to the *People*, theſe Calculations are Dictates of Sedition; and only meant to engage the Credulous, and heady Multitude in falſe Opinions both of the Tyranny of Prelates, and their own Power.

Thus far in *Obſervation* upon the firſt Part of *The Intereſt of* England, *in the matter of Religion*, &c. ——— *The whole ſtructure whereof* (in his own words) *reſts upon theſe Poſitions, as its adæquate Foundation.*

1. *That whilſt the two forenamed Parties remain divided, both the Proteſtant Religion, and the Kingdom of* England *is divided againſt it ſelf.*

2. *That the* Presbyterians *cannot be rooted out, nor their Intereſt ſwallowed up, whilſt the State of* England *remaineth Proteſtant.*

3. *That their ſubverſion, if it be poſſible to be accompliſhed, will be very pernicious to the Proteſtant Religion, and the Kingdom of* England.

4. *That the Coalition of both Parties into one may be effected by an equal accommodation, without repugnancy to their conſcientious Principles on either ſide, in ſo much that nothing*

nothing juſtifiable by Religion or ſound Reaſon can put a Bar to this deſirable Union.

The *whole matter* (in Debate, he tells us) reſts upon Three main Enquiries.

I. Qu. *Whether in Juſtice or Reaſon of State the* Presbyterian *Party ſhould be Rejected and Depreſſed, or Protected and Incouraged.* Pag. 17. *part* 1.

II. Qu. *Whether the* Presbyterian *Party may be Protected and Incouraged, and the Epiſcopal not Deſerted nor Diſobliged.*

III. Qu. *Whether the Upholding of both Parties by a juſt and equal accommodation be not in it ſelf more deſirable and more agreeable to the State of* England, *than the abſolute Exalting of the one Party, and the total Subverſion of the other.*

I ſhall now offer ſome further Reaſonings of my Own, upon this Subject; therein propoſing ſuch *Brevity* and *Clearneſs*, that both the Lazy, and the Buſie may find time to read it, and the Weakeſt not want Capacity to underſtand it.

His *firſt Poſition* holds no further good, than as the *Presbyterians* are firſt *Proteſtants* in the matter of the *Difference*, and then *Conſiderable* in the ballance of the *Nation*. *Religion* led the Quarrel, ſo let it the Diſpute. In uſing the Word *Proteſtant*, I follow Cuſtom, for I had rather call it *Catholick*: but *Proteſtant* let it be.

I ſuppoſe by the Proteſtant Religion, we underſtand That of the Reformed Churches: to whoſe Deciſion we ſhall willingly ſubmit the ſum of our Diſagreements: which may be ſtated under a Reduction to theſe Two Queſtions.

I. Qu. *Whether or no the Government of the Church by* Archbiſhops *and* Biſhops——*be* Antichriſtian, *or* Unlawful?

II. *Whether ſuch Laws of Humane and Significant Inſtitution, as are orderly made, and neither contradict the General Law of* Nature, *nor any poſitive Law in* Scripture,——*be Binding or not?*

Firſt, Concerning the *Prelacy*: *Luther* himſelf diſtinguiſhes betwixt *Popiſh Tyrants*, and *True Biſhops*: profeſſing his Quarrel to them as *Popiſh*, not as *Biſhops*.

Apol: Confeſs: per Pap. Pag: 131. The Authors of the *Auguſtane Confeſſion*, leave it upon Record, *That they would willingly preſerve the Eccleſiaſtical and Canonical Polity, if the Biſhops would ceaſe to Tyrannize over their Churches.*

De reform: adver: Eccleſ: pag: 95. *Bucer* adviſes by all means *the reſtoring of ſuch Eccleſiaſtical Governments as the Canons preſcribe*, (Epiſcopis & Metropolitanis) *to* Biſhops *and* Metropolitans. Melancthon *to* Luther,——*You would not imagine* (ſays he) *how ſome people are nettled to ſee Church-polity reſtored: as if it were the Romiſh Sovereignty again.* Ita de Regno ſuo, non de Evangelio, dimicant ſocii noſtri.

Calvin himſelf recommends the *Hierarchy* to the King of *Poland*: and treating concerning the Primitive Church, ſays, *That the Ancient Government by Archbiſhops and Biſhops, and the* Nicene *Conſtitution of Patriarchs, was for Orders-ſake, and Good Government.* ad Diſciplinæ conſervationem pertinebat.

The ſame perſon being called to accompt by Cardinal *Sadolet* concerning the *Geneva* defection, and for ſubſcribing the *Auguſtan Confeſſion* renders this Anſwer. *Curſed be ſuch as oppoſe that* Hierarchy, *which ſubmits it ſelf to Chriſt Jeſus.* Nullo non *Anathemate* dignos cenſeo, quotquot illi *Hierarchiæ*, qui ſe *Domino Jeſu* ſubmittit, ſubjici nolunt.

Zanchy (the Compiler of the Gallican Confeſſion) obſerves a Change of *Name*, rather than of *Office* throughout moſt of the *German* Churches. *Biſhops* and *Archbiſhops* being only diſguiſed under the Notion of *Superintendents*, and *General-Superintendents*: acknowledging, *that by the conſent of Hiſtories, Councels, and the ancient*

ancient Fathers thoſe Orders have been generally Allowed of by all Chriſtian Societies.

Beza, (the rigid Succeſſour of *Calvin*,) being check'd by the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, for intermedling beyond his ſpheare, —*We do not charge* (ſays he) *all* Archbiſhops *&* Biſhops *with Tyranny.* —— *The Church of* England *hath afforded many Learned men, and many Glorious Martyrs of that Function. If that Authority be there ſtill in Being may a perpetual Bleſſing go along with it.* Fruatur ſane iſta ſingulari Dei beneficentia, quæ utinam illi ſit perpetua. This with all Ceremony was addreſſed, ——*Totius Angliæ Primati: to the* Primate *of all* England, *and in the Name of the whole Church of* Geneva.

Saravia makes him ſpeak yet plainer; who arguing for the *Hierarchy* out of the Apoſtles Canons, receives from *Beza* this Reply. *This is no more than what we wiſh might be reſtored to all Churches. Quid aliud hic ſtatuitur, quam quod in omnibus locis Eccleſiis reſtitutum cupimus?* Bez. *contra* Sarav. *p.* 116.

Zanchy comes up to the very Caſe of *England*; (nay and a little further too) not only affirming *Epiſcopacy to be agreeable to the Word of God.* But where it is in exerciſe, that it ought to continue, and where by violence it hath been aboliſh'd, that it ought to be reſtored. *Ubi vigent* (Iſti ordines ſcil.) *non eſſe Abolendos, & ubicunque Iniquitas temporum eos abolevit, Reſtituendos.*

With what Face now ſhall the *Enemies* of *Biſhops* call themſelves *Proteſtants*, in this particular at leaſt, wherein they evidently croſs the whole ſtream of Proteſtant Divines? Now to the *Second Quæry.*

Whether ſuch Laws of Humane, and Significant Inſtitution, as are orderly made, and neither contradict the General Laws of Nature, nor any Poſitive Law in Scripture, be binding or not?

Hear *Calvin* firſt. *Quamvis quod obtruditur ſcandalum afferat, quia tamen verbo Dei per ſe non repugnat concedi poteſt. Scandals Taken*, without Repugnancy to the Word of God, are not ſufficient to invalidate the the Obligation of a *Ceremony* impoſed by the Church. *Beza* himſelf, nay, Mr. *Cartwright*, the Captain of our Bleſſed Legions, will allow, rather than quit a *Benefice*, to wear a Surplice. Calvin *Epiſt.* Pag. 341.

Bucer

Bucer *thanks God with all his Soul to ſee the Engliſh* Ceremonies *ſo pure*, and conform to the Word of God; or at leaſt (rightly underſtood) not contrary to it.

Scripta Anglicana, 455.

Not to hunt further for particular Authorities, I ſhall be bold with my own Brother, and make uſe of ſome general Collections which He hath gathered ready to my hand.

H.L.S. His Affinity of Sacred Liturgies, *p.*27

Nothing aſſuredly can be more demonſtrative of the Proteſtant *Tenents, than the Confeſſion of their ſeveral Churches.*

Cap. 27. *That of* Helvetia *firſt*, [*Churches have always uſed their Liberty in Rites, as being things indifferent, which we alſo do at this day.*] Cap. 15. *That of* Bohemia, [*Humane Traditions and Ceremonies brought in by good Cuſtom, are with an uniform Conſent to be retained in the Eccleſiaſtical Aſſemblies of Chriſtian People at the Common Service of God.*] Act. 32. *the* Gallican; [*Every place may have their peculiar Conſtitutions, as it ſhall ſeem convenient for them.*] Act. 32. *The* Belgick; [*We receive thoſe Laws as are fit, either to cheriſh or maintain Concord, or to keep us in the Obedience of God.*] Act. 15. *That of* Ausburg; [*Eccleſiaſtical Rites which are ordained by mans Authority, and tend to Quietneſs and good Order in the Church, are to be obſerved.*] Act. 20. *That of* Saxony; [*For Order ſake, there muſt be ſome decent and ſeemly Ceremonies.*] Cap. 14. *That of* Sweveland; [*Such Traditions of men as agree with the Scriptures, and were ordained for good Manners, and the Profit of Men, are worthily to be accounted rather of God than of Man.*] *Theſe were the Tenents they publickly owned, nor did they act different from what they taught, ordaining Churches, Pulpits, Prayers before and after Sermon, adminiſtring the Sacraments in Churches, delivering the Communion in the Forenoons, to Women, Baptizing Infants, and ſeveral other things, not one whereof were directly commanded by either Chriſt, or his Apoſtles.*

From hence it is manifeſt, we may divide from *Presbyterians*, and yet *the Proteſtant Religion not be divided againſt it ſelf.* A *Schiſm* there is, but whether in the *Church*, or in the *Faction*, is only a Diſpute for thoſe that plead the *Authority of Tumults.* As their Opinions are not one jot *Proteſtant*, where they divide from *Biſhops*;

Biſhops; ſo neither are their *Morals* any more warrantable, wherein they act as *Men*. Which ſhall we credit, *Words* or *Deeds*? Will they not *Bite*, where they pretend to *Kiſs*? A famous *Martyr* of that Party, (*Hacket*) ſerved a Fellow ſo. Some difference there had been, and they were to be made friends, *Hacket* pretends a Reconcilement; takes the man in his Arms, bites off his Noſe, and ſwallows it. This is that *Hacket* that was joyned with *Coppinger*, and *Arthington*, in a Plot to murther the Lords in the *Star-Chamber*, becauſe they had committed *Cartwright* (the great *Rabbi* of the Party) whoſe Crime was only the erecting of the *Presbytery* without, and againſt the Queens Authority. Thus we ſee, *That in Queen* Elizabeth's *days too, the Proteſtant Religion was divided againſt it ſelf.* Briefly, that it is not *Religion* which moves theſe People, is moſt apparent, from their unquiet and diſtempered Actings; proceed we now to enquire what it is, or in plain terms, to unmask the Holy Cheat, and ſhew it barefac'd to the People.

Of all Impreſſions, thoſe of Religion are the deepeſt; and of all Errors, the moſt to be lamented, and indulged, are thoſe of tender and miſ-guided Conſciences. The Clearneſs of this Principle conſidered, it is no wonder that the fouleſt Deſigns, put on the greateſt ſhews of Holineſs, as the only way to gain and rule Affections, without which no great Matters can be accompliſh'd. This is a Truth well known to the *Presbyterians*, and of experiment as ancient as their Diſcipline.

We do not undertake to read their *Hearts*, but their *Writings* we may venture upon; enquire a little into their *Practices*, and by comparing both, give ſome tolerable gueſs at their *Intentions*. The readieſt way is to look back, and match them; for the beſt proſpect of the Future is behind.

The Riſe of Presbytery.

Some Grumblings toward the Conſiſtorian Diſcipline, there were in the Days of *Edward* the Sixth: But the firſt notorious Separation, was that of *Frankford* (in the Reign of Queen *Mary*) when *Gilby*, *Goodman*, and *Whittingham*, with their Companions, flew off, and went to *Geneva*; from whence they returned into *England*, ſoon after Queen *Elizabeth* came to the Crown. *Theſe* led the Dance in *England*; *Knox* in *Scotland*, and at this day our *Presbyterians* do but write after their Copy; profeſſing the ſame *Principles*, pretending the ſame *Scruples*, and beyond

yond doubt, propoſing the ſame *End*; which was to get the ſame Dominion here, which *Calvin* and *Beza* exerciſed at *Geneva*: to whom they ſtill repair'd for Counſel, as they needed.

Cartwright and *Travers* came in the Breech of thoſe, but not without conſulting *Beza* firſt, to learn the Knack of the *Geneva*-Model. Theſe were the men, that firſt brought into *England* that horrible Poſition, that the *Geneva*-Diſcipline was as eſſential a Note of the Church, as either *the true Preaching of the Word*, or *the due Adminiſtration of the Sacraments*. This is the Principle which ſupports the *Presbyterian* Intereſt.

The Proceſs of Presbytery.

For the firſt thirteen years of the Queens Reign, they contented themſelves to throw about their Libels againſt Ceremonies, and divide into *Conventicles.*

In the 14*th.* of Her Majeſty, they addreſſed two *Admonitions* to the *Parliament*; the former in the quality of a *Remonſtrance* with a Platform; the other, bolder, and more peremptory. This Parliament was no ſooner Diſſolved, but they fell preſently to work upon their *Diſcipline*; the Progreſs whereof, is with great exactneſs ſet down in the Third *Book of* Bancroft's *Dangerous Poſitions.*

Dangerous Poſitions. Page 43. *In* 1572. *A Presbytery was Erected at* Wadſworth *in* Surrey, *at which time they had alſo their Conventicles in* London, *where little was debated, but againſt Subſcription, the Attire, and Book of Common-Prayer.*

Pag. 44. *In* 82. *A Meeting was appointed of* 60 *Miniſters, out of* Eſſex, Cambridgeſhire, *and* Norfolk, *at* Cockfield; *to confer about the Common-Prayer,* —— *what might be tolerated.*

Pag. 45. *In* 83. *The Form of Diſcipline was compiled, and Decrees made touching the Practice of it, which ſoon after were put in execution.*

Pag. 75. *In* 87. *The* Diſcipline *was received, and put in practice in* Northamptonſhire.

Pag. 86. *In* 88. *A Claſſical Aſſembly at* Coventry.

Pag. 89. *In* 89. *A General Meeting in* Cambridge, *and another at* Ipſwich.

Pag. 91. *In* 1590. *Upon the Detection of the Premiſes, they refuſed to anſwer upon Oath.*

Being

Being thus Aſſociated, they appropriate to their Meetings *the Name of the* Church, *and uſe the ſtile.* Pag. 120.

The Offices of Lord Archbiſhops, and Biſhops, *&c.* (ſays *Martin Junior*) are condemned by the Doctrine of the Church of *England.* Pag. 125.

By theſe degrees the Schiſmaticks advanced to a dangerous height, and Boldneſs; *and of this Temper, and Extraction are our Presbyterians.*

After the aforementioned diſcovery, a ſtricter eye and hand was kept upon them; divers of the Ring-leaders were Impriſoned, and the Covy broken.

Upon the coming in of King *James*, they began to ſtir again, but he knew them too well, either to Truſt, or Suffer them.

How they behaved themſelves towards the late King, is to the eternal Infamy, not only of the Faction, but of the Nation, too notorious: what they deſign toward the preſent Government, That's the Queſtion: And now I come to enquire.——

Whether in Juſtice or Reaſon of State the Presbyterian *Party ſhould be Rejected and Depreſſed, or Protected and Incouraged.*

Before I fall upon the Queſtion, once again I explain my ſelf. By *PRESBYTERIAN*, I intend a *Faction*, that under Colour of ſetling a Reform'd *DISCIPLINE*, ſeeks to diſſolve the frame of an eſtabliſhed *Government.* And firſt I am to prove that Party ſo diſtinguiſh'd, ſuch a *Faction*, which both from their own *Practices*, *Poſitions*, and from Common Obſervation, and Authority, I think I ſhall make good; and that their laſt aim is to exerciſe that Tyranny themſelves, which they pretend to puniſh.

Presbyters Doctrine concerning Kings.

We'll firſt examine how they treat the Civil Power.

If Princes be Tyrants againſt God and his Truth, their Subjects are freed from their Oaths of Obedience. *Knox* to *Engl.* and *Scotl.* fol. 78.

Kings, Princes, and Governors have their Authority of the People, and upon Occaſion, the People may take it away again. *Gilby* Obedience. *pag.* 25.

Regiſter. p. 48. *Miniſters ought not to obey the Prince when he preſcribes Ceremonies, and a Faſhion of Apparel.*

Goodman. pag. 144. *Evil Princes ought by the Law of God to be depoſed.*

Spotſwood Hiſtory of the Church of *Scotland.* pag. 330. Andrew Melvil *being cited to anſwer for Treaſon delivered in a Sermon, declined the judgment of the King, affirming,* That what was ſpoken in Pulpit, ought firſt to be Tryed and Judged by the Presbytery; and that neither the King nor Council might *in prima inſtantia,* meddle therewith, although the Speeches were Treaſonable.

Scots Plea, *pag.* 262. *Strike the Baſilick vein; nothing but this will cure the Pleuriſie of our State.*

King's Declaration concerning *Scotland,* p. 404. *Let us never give over, till we have the King in our Power, and then he ſhall ſee how good Subjects we are. (Delivered in a Sermon.)*

Ibid. *pag.* 409. *It is Lawful for Subjects to make a Covenant, and Combination without the King.*

But to come nearer Home, to ſhew that the whole Gang is of the ſame Leaven. Worſe than all this was daily Printed againſt the late King, even by thoſe Perſons that were in pay to the *Presbyterian* Faction: and yet at laſt, thoſe outrages are juſtified againſt the *Father,* by ſuch as would be thought Loyal to the *Son.*

If Parliaments think to eſcape better they are deceived.

Bancroft, pag. 169. *If the Brethren cannot obtain their will by ſute, nor diſpute, the Multitude, and People muſt do the Feat.*

Kings Declaration, *fol.* 404. One Preached, *That though there were never ſo many Acts of Parliament againſt the Covenant, yet it ought to be maintain'd againſt them all.*

Ibid. 408. *The Parliament can make no Law at all concerning the Church, but only ratifie what the Church Decrees: and after it hath ratified it, yet if the Aſſembly of the Church ſhall prohibit it, and repeal that Decree of the Church, all the Subjects are diſcharged from yielding Obedience to that Act of Parliament.*

Ibid. 411. *An Aſſembly may abrogate Acts of Parliament, if they any way reflect upon buſineſs of the Church.*

Knox. *Reformation of Religion belongs to the Commonalty.*

Of

Of the Parliament *in the 24. year of the Queen* (ſays the Supplication) *if the deſired Reformation be not granted*; There ſhall not be a man of their ſeed that ſhall proſper, be a Parliament man, or bear rule in *England* any more.

Concerning *Laws eſtabliſhed*; They *Fall* in Conſequence with the Power that makes them.

Presbyterians Opinion of Biſhops.

Let us ſee now with what modeſty they treat the *Church*, and firſt the *Biſhops*.

They are Ordinances of the Devil. — Proud, Popiſh, preſumptuous, prophane, paltry, peſtilent, pernicious Prelates, and Uſurpers. — Robbers, Wolves, Simoniacks, Perſecutors, Sowers of Sedition, Dragons, (and ſo to the end of the Chapter.) *Bancroft*, pag. 59.

Their Clergy an Antichriſtian, Swiniſh Rabble, —— *The* Miniſters *are neither proved, elected, called, nor ordained according to Gods word.* Ibid. *pag.* 58.

The Ceremonies —*Carnal, Beggerly, Antichriſtian Pomps.*

Presbyterian Reformation.

Hitherto, the *Faults* of Governors, and Government, now their Propoſals of *Amendment*, and *Reformation*; by what *Rules*, and by what *Means* we may be Governed *Better*. *Thus then.*

Let the whole Government of the Church be committed to the Miniſters, Elders and Deacons. Admon. 1.

Very good; and to whom the Government of the *State?*

Why to *Them* too. *For the Church wherein any Magiſtrate*, King *or* Emperor *is a member, is divided into ſome that are to* Govern: *viz. Paſtors, Doctors, and Elders: and into ſuch as are to obey*, viz. *Magiſtrates of all ſorts, and the People.* *Cartwright.*

The Queſtion is next, about the Extent of the *Eccleſiaſtical* Power, and in what manner That Aſſumption hooks in all Civil actions within their Cogniſance?

In Ordine ad Spiritualia, Forſooth: by which rule nothing ſcapes them. Holy Diſcipline, *pag.* 260.

'Tis the deſire of the *Admonitor*; *that he and his Companions may be deliver'd by Act of Parliament, from the Authority of the Civil Magiſtrates: as Juſtices and others, and from their Indictings, and Finings.*

Ibid. 284. Ibid. *The Elderſhip ſhall ſuffer no lewd cuſtoms to remain in their Pariſhes, either Games, or otherwiſe.* And further; *The Office of the Church Governors, is to decide Controverſies in Doctrine, and Manners,* ſo far as pertaineth *to Conſcience, and the Church Cenſures.*

Ibid. 285. *Every Fault* (ſays *Cartwright*) *that tendeth either to the Hurt of a mans Neighbour, or to the hinderance of the Glory of God, is to be examin'd and dealt in by the Orders of the holy Church.* Nay *Knox* goes further yet.

The bare *Suſpition of Avarice, or of Pride, Superfluity, or Rioteuſneſs in Chear or Rayment.* ——— Even this Nicety, Falls within their Cenſure.

Now would I know what need of a *Civil Magiſtrate*, when even our private thoughts are ſubjected to the Scrutiny of a *Presbytery?*

But will ſome ſay, what ſignifies the intemperance of Particular tongues, as to the General of the Party. I am challenged by the Author of the *Intereſt of England*, to produce their *Actions*: and *That's* my next Immediate Buſineſs.

The Presbyter has now the Chair, ſee how he manages his Greatneſs. None of that Tyranny ye found in *Biſhops*, I warrant ye: no *Groaning* now under the Yoke of *Anti-Chriſt*; the intolerable burthen of *Canonical Subſcription*; *the Impoſition of Ceremonies properly Sacred*; *the Injunction of the Croſs in Baptiſm*; *and that abominable* Idol *the Common Prayer.*

Some *words* perhaps may ſlip unwarily, that might have been as well let alone; but alas good People, they mean no harm.

Intereſt of *England*. Part. 2. pag. 81. [*Suppoſe that ſome of this way were guilty of ſome provoking forwardneſs, ſhould grave Patriots, and wiſe Counſellors thereupon deſtroy the weak Party, or rather heal it?*] 'Tis indeed poſſible, that in the heat of a Reforming and Spiritual zeal, they may have let fall Speeches of holy Indignation againſt the Oppoſers of the *LORDS ORDINANCE*. But have they ſhewed their diſaffection either to * *King* or *Parliament, by any thing deſcernable in their outward behaviour:* have they controlled the *Law* of the Land, or the juſt *Liberty* of the People?

By which term they uſe to difference their Claſſical Approbation, from Epiſcopal Ordination. Intereſt of England. Part. 2. p. 57.

If they have *not* done all this, there's a great failing both in our Stories, and our Memories. I know 'twill be objected, they *Petitioned*, and in a ſupplicant,

ſupplicant, and humble way, ſutable to the duty of good Subjects. They did *Petition*; and in this manner.——— about the 27 of the *Queen.*)

May it pleaſe Your Majeſty, &c. ——*That it may be Enacted*, &c.----*That the Book hereunto annexed*, &c. *Intituled, a Book of the form of Common Prayers, Adminiſtration of Sacraments*, &c.——— *And every thing therein contained, may be from henceforth authorized, put in ure, and practiſed throughout all Your Majeſties Dominions.* *The Reformers way of Petitioning.*

Herein they preſs upon the Nation their *own Form*, which would not yet allow of any *Other.*

What they could not get eſtabliſhed by Law, they ſettle yet by Practice, and privately agree upon a general endeavour to encreaſe the Party. But ſay they ſhould be oppoſed? *Holy Diſcipline* pag. 100.

Why then, have a fling at *Evil Counſellours. If Her Majeſty give ear to ſuch Counſellours, She may have cauſe one day to lament.* Then they *Remonſtrate, how miſerably poor men have been handled*; *That Godly Miniſters have been brought before the Bars of Juſtice*; *and that if this Perſecution be not provided for, it is the Caſe of many a thouſand in* England: *great troubles will come of it.* Bancrofts *dangerous Poſit.* pag. 53. Ibid. *pag.* 56. Ibid. *pag.* 57.

This numerous Party will not vary from it ſelf, &c. ———*The minds of men are fix'd in this Opinion, and are not like to be reduced to the practice of former times*, Well ſaid *I. C.* yet. *Thouſands* (ſays another) *do ſigh for this Diſcipline*; *and ten thouſands have ſought it. We do proteſt unto Your Majeſty*, (ſay the Supplicators) *that we will be no longer ſubject unto the Biſhops unlawful, and uſurped Authority*, &c.——And another. *The truth will prevail*, (ſpeaking of the Diſcipline) *in ſpight of your teeth*, (meaning the Biſhops) *and all other Adverſaries of it.* Intereſt of *England*, p. 29. Ibid. Bancroft, *pag.* 138. Ibid. 11. 140.

In the late Kings *Declaration, concerning the Tumults in Scotland:* this way of Petitioning is very frequent: and this is that my Friend hints, in ſaying, *that the Presbyterians have never ceaſed to ſollicite, and ſupplicate*, &c. But *Words* draw no *Blood.* Intereſt of *England*, p. 53.

'Tis true, but ſuch as theſe come very near it.

We

We *Phanſie* firſt, defects in Government; *Then* we *diſcourſe* them; after *That*, we *propoſe* a Reformation, which, if rejected, we proceed to *preſs* it: the *next* ſtep is a *Threat*, and *then* a *Blow*.

Where there are failings in Authority, 'tis not for private Perſons to take publick notice of them. Whoever does *that*, would *ſtrike* if he *durſt*. This is not meant of every ſlip, in common diſcourſe, either of *Heat*, or *Inadvertency*; (yet *that* is very ill too) but of *deliberate* Affronts; ſuch as proceed from a form'd *Habit* of Irreverence: and in that Caſe, I think 'twere no hard meaſure, if he that ſets his hand to the Kings diſhonour, ſhould loſe his Head for't.

Take it at worſt. Put caſe a Prince *Miſ-governs*; yet we are ſure, that his *Superior* does not; and that reſpect we cannot pay to his *Failings*, we muſt allow to his *Commiſſion*. From *Words* proceed we now to *Actions*.

Presbyterian Practices toward their

SOVEREIGN.

THE *Presbyterian* is no ſooner in the Saddle, but (in the name of *Reformation*) how the man Gallops! *Kings*, *Parliaments*, *Laws*, and *Liberties*, *Oaths*, and *Covenants* are but as Feathers in his way.

I ſhall not clog this Section with many Inſtances. The Trayterous actings of the *Conventicle* at *Glaſgow*, in 1638: the horrid outrages that uſher'd it, and the moſt deplorable conſequences that enſued upon it, contain enough to brand that Faction to eternity.

I ſhall the rather fix *there*, becauſe it brings the Caſe home; and firſt, in regard that the *Schiſmaticks* of both Nations acted by the ſame tye of Oath, and Intereſt. Next, as it is the Model, they have made the People Swear they would be damn'd by. Some of their many Inſolencies are theſe.

I. *The*

Poſitions of the Conventicle at *Glaſgow* An. 1638.

I. *The Aſſembly is Independent either, from King or Parliament, in Matters Eccleſiaſtical.*

II. *It is Lawful for Subjects to Covenant and Combine without the King, and to enter into a Bond of mutual defence againſt Him.*

III. *An Aſſembly may abrogate Acts of Parliament, and diſcharge their fellow-Subjects from obedience to them, if they any way reflect upon the buſineſs of the Church.*

IV. *They deny the Kings right of Calling or Diſſolving Aſſemblies, and they continue to Sit and Act, notwithſtanding His Majeſties expreſs Order for their Diſſolution.* (See the Kings Declaration.)

Theſe Rebellious Proceedings are yet darkened by the tranſcending uſurpations that followed them. But here I am bounded; This only I may ſay;

Whoever has a mind to run the extremities of another War, and to ſee another King murther'd, let him give his Vote for Presbytery. And here let every man look behind him, and lay his finger on his Mouth.

Presbyters tyrannous to the People. *Bancroft*, pag. 20. Ibid. *pag.* 105.

As the *Geneva* Diſcipline is injurious to *Kings*, and ſtated *Laws*, ſo it is moſt ridiculouſly tyrannous to the *People*. *A great uproar ariſing in* Edenburgh, *about the making of a* Robbin-hood, *they of the Conſiſtory, did excommunicate the whole Multitude.* 'Tis a ſtrange tenderneſs poſſeſſes theſe Saints. *One of them being to Chriſten a Child, brake off in the middle of the Action, becauſe he would not call it* Richard.

Presbyters perſecutors of King *James*. King *James* his works. *Pag.* 305.

I ſuppoſe no man knew this kind of Cattel better than King *James*. *I was perſecuted* (ſays that learned Prince) by Puritans, *not from my Birth only, but even ſince four Months before my Birth.* And to Prince *Henry* thus:

Ibid. *Pag.* 160.

Take heed to ſuch Puritans, very Peſts in the Church and Common-weal, whom no deſerts can oblige, neither Oaths or Promiſes bind, breathing nothing but Sedition, and Calumnies, aſpiring without meaſure, railing without reaſon, and making their own imaginations (without any warrant of the Word) the ſquare of their Conſcience. I proteſt before the great God,

and

The Antiquity of *Phanaticks.*

and ſince I am here as upon my Teſtament, it is no place for me to lye in, that ye ſhall never find with any Highlands, or Border Thieves, greater ingratitude, and more lies and vile perjuries, than with theſe Phanatick *ſpirits.* And I think every man may ſay as much that hath but known them.

We are at length by Gods great mercy, delivered from thoſe Evangelical Impoſtors, and after all our wandrings brought once again into the Channel. We have our *Prince*, our *Laws*, our *Freedoms*, our Intereſt lies before us, and certainly we cannot be ſo mad, as now to daſh a ſecond time upon the ſame Rock: *Yet they ſhall loſe nothing for want of offering at it.*

The Arguments of 1641. are ſet on foot again: The very ſame with *Cartwrights*, (that *Conſiſtorian Patriarch*, as *Bancroft* terms him) nay, they are advanced already beyond *pleading* of their Cauſe, to *preſſing* of it, by ſawcy Importunities, and peremptory threatnings.

From what I have deliver'd, it cannot be deny'd but their Poſitions are Deſtructive to all *Civil Government*; And for their Practices, the Story is written in Blood.

This might ſuffice to end the Controverſie concerning *Reaſon of State*, for certainly a Faction ſo Principled, cannot with ſafety to the Publick be Incorporated into any Politick Conſtitution. But I ſhall add ſome further Reaſons, why by no means they are to be admitted.

Reaſons againſt *Coalition.*

1. *They're a Party never to be gain'd by* Obligations: *and this is manifeſt from their proceedings toward the late King, whoſe moſt unhappy Tenderneſs of Nature coſt him his Life. And at this inſtant, that irreclaimable ingratitude is yet more clear towards His Majeſty in being: whoſe unexampled Mercy, ſo much as lies in them, is converted to his* Diſhonor, *and* Deſtruction.

2ly. *They ground their claim upon the Equity of their Cauſe, which if allow'd, by the ſame Reaſon they may ſerve this King as they did His Father.*

3ly. *Their Demands are* Endleſs, *as well as* Groundleſs, *and it is not Prudential to grant any thing, to a Faction that will be ſatisfied with nothing. It is but* Giving *them a Power to* Take *the Reſt.*

4ly. *They*

4ly. *They* Expoſtulate, *and what they get upon thoſe Terms, they look upon rather as a* Submiſſion, *than a* Conceſſion. *The very manner of their Addreſs has a ſpice of* Mutiny *in it, and they will hardly make an honeſt uſe of what they compaſs by diſhoneſt means.*

5ly. *It is not adviſable to encourage Tumultuary Combinations by Rewarding them.*

6ly. *The Diſpute is not ſo much what their* Conſciences *will* Bear, *as what their* Importunties *can* Obtain: *and to feel the Pulſe of the Supreme Authority.*

In fine, it is a conteſt betwixt the Law *and a* Faction, *and a fair ſtep toward a New Rebellion.*

So much for *Reaſon of State.*

Now to the *Juſtice* of their pretences. The *Quære* is,

Whether in Juſtice or Reaſon of State the Presbyterian *Party ſhould be Rejected and Depreſſed, or Protected and Incouraged.*

'Tis one thing what the *King* may *do* in point of *Juſtice*, and another thing what the *Presbyterians* may *demand* upon that ſcore.

There is a *Juſtice* of *Conſcience*, *Honor*, and of *Prudence.*

Juſtice of Conſcience.

By the *Firſt:* His Majeſty is ty'd up in common with the meaneſt of His Subjects. That is, if the King find himſelf in Conſcience bound to maintain Epiſcopacy in the ſtate he found it, (Legally ſettled) he is not free to alter it.

Juſtice of Honor.

In point of *Honor:* There's more Liberty, and whatever the King does in that Particular, is well done. But His Majeſty not having as yet declar'd himſelf; what do we know, how far even upon That Point he may concern himſelf to reject the Presbyterians Demands: Partly out of *Reverence* to His Royal *Father*; in part, out of a Princely ſtrictneſs to His own *Dignity:* and Partly out of a Generous tenderneſs toward his Ruin'd Party.

Firſt, As to what may ſeem relating to His Majeſties *Father.*

Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ. *pag.* 239.

That which theſe People urge, is what the late King choſe rather to *Dye*, than *Grant:* which in His Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ is intimated in theſe words.

In these two points, the preservation of established Religion, and Laws, I may (without vanity) turn the reproach of my sufferings, as to the Worlds censure, into the honor of a kind of Martyrdom, as to the Testimony of my own Conscience, the troublers of my Kingdoms, having nothing to object against me but this, that I prefer Religion, and Laws established, before these alterations they propounded.

Every word hath its weight, which fell from the Pen of that pious and judicious Prince. Nor can I overpass a caution of His learned Fathers; when I consider the sum of their proposals, which in effect is but a Condemnation of the late *King*, in the bold, and needless justification of *Themselves*. These are the words.

King James's *works.* P. 157. *As for offences against your own Person and Authority, since the fault concerneth your self, I remit to your own choice to Punish or Pardon therein as your Heart serveth you, and according to the circumstances of the turn, and the quality of the Committer.*

Here would I also eike another Crime to be unpardonable, if I should not be thought partial: But the Fatherly love I bear you, will make me break the bounds of shame, in opening it unto you. It is then, the false and unreverent writing, or speaking of malicious men against your Parents and Predecessors. And a little further.

It is a thing monstrous to see a Man love the Child, and hate the Parents: as on the other part, the infaming and making odious of the Parents, is the ready way to bring the Son into contempt. And for conclusion of this point, I may also alledge my own experience: For besides the judgments of God, that with my eyes I have seen fall upon all them that were chief Traytors to my Parents, I may justly affirm, I never found yet a constant biding by me in all my straits, by any that were of perfect age in my Parents days, but only by such as constantly bode by them; *I mean, specially by them, that served the Queen My Mother; for so that I discharge my Conscience to You, my Son, in revealing to You the Truth, I care not what any Traytor, or Treasonallower, think of it.*

Thus far His Majesty may find Himself concern'd in *Honor* to His Fathers Ashes, now to his dying *Counsels.*

Take

Take heed of Abetting any Factions, or Applying to any publick Diſcriminations in Matters of Religion, contrary to what is in your Judgment, and the Church well ſetled. The late King's Counſels.

I cannot yet learn that Leſſon, nor I hope ever will you, that it is ſafe for a King to gratifie any Faction with the perturbation of the Laws, *in which is wrapt up the publick Intereſt, and the Good of the Community.* Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ. p. 236. Ibid. p. 239.

What in effect do theſe People now deſire, but that his Majeſty would rather take their Counſel, than his Fathers? In the next Page, the King expreſſes a more than ordinary Earneſtneſs; in theſe Words:

My Counſel and Charge to you is, that you ſeriouſly conſider the former real or objected Miſcarriages, which might occaſion my Troubles, that you may avoid them. Ibid. 240.

Herein, his Maieſty is tacitly conjured againſt them; it being a moſt notorious Certainty, That **the late King loſt both his Crown and Life by overgranting**. The now-pretended Cauſe of the Quarrel was not mention'd till after the War was begun. The Colour of raiſing an Army, being to fetch in Delinquents. *After which* (ſays his Majeſty) *among other leſſer Innovations, this chiefly was urged: the Abolition of* Epiſcopal, *and the Eſtabliſhment of* Presbyterian *Government.* Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ, p. 62.

As to that Point of *Imperial Honour*, wherein his Majeſty may poſſibly concern himſelf more immediately: It is a high exceſs of Goodneſs to make his Favours *Common*, where they are look'd upon ſo *Cheap*, (as *here*; Witneſs theſe daily new Tranſgreſſions ſince his moſt Gracious Pardon.) *Some men* (ſays the late King) *have that height, as to interpret all fair Condeſcendings, as Arguments of Feebleneſs, and glory moſt in an unflexible Stiffneſs, when they ſee Others moſt ſupple, and inclinable to them.* Ibid. p. 169.

There remains yet a *third* Queſtion under this Head of *Honour*; that is, *How far his Majeſties* Generoſity *may extend it ſelf in Favour, and Protection of thoſe Perſons that have ſerv'd him, through all extremities, till they have nothing left them beyond the hopes of Honourable Epitaphs,*

Theſe People have *Conſciences* too; a ſenſe of *Duty* and *Religion*. They reverence the *Epiſcopal Order*, and *That*, which through the Sides of *Biſhops*, was equally wounded, the Order of *Kings*. At laſt, thoſe that *ſubverted* the Former, and *uſurped* the Latter, demand (I think in reparation of their hazards) a *Presbyterian Government*. In that particular, our Duty teaches us not to direct our Maſter; only we take ſober Freedom to anſwer our Accuſers; and to profeſs to all the World, that thoſe who fought *For King*, and *Biſhops*, were in our Opinion as honeſt Men at leaſt as they that fought *Againſt them*.

To his Majeſties *Honourable* Conſideration, I think in this point we may claim a Right. We have ſuffer'd *For* and *With* his Royal *Father*, and *Himſelf*; and the main Juſtice of the Cauſe, betwixt the King, and thoſe that ſerv'd him, is the ſame thing: ſo that whoever ſtrikes at *Us*, wounds our *Sovereign*.

Laſtly, There is a *Juſtice* of *Prudence*, wherein a man may frame a thouſand Reaſons againſt the *Encouraging* of the *Presbyterians*: not ſpeculative, and aiery Notions, but cloſe, and pinching *Reaſons*, grounded upon weighty *Authority*, and a never-failing courſe of long *Experience* (Yet not to dictate to his Majeſty, in whoſe Will we ſubmit our Reaſonings.)

Firſt, If their *Deſires* were Modeſt, the *Manner* yet of promoting them, is too rude and poſitive; they *Preach* and *Print* their Grievances, which is the way rather to ſtir a *Faction*, than allay a *Scruple*. *Lord*, (ſays Mr. *Manton*) *give us the Liberty of the Goſpel, before we go hence and be no more ſeen.* As if *Epiſcopacy* were *Paganiſm*. 'Tis dangerous to *grant more*, to thoſe that *take too much*. How do I reverence the Divine Spirit of his late Majeſty!

Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ. p. 182. *The great Miſcarriage I think is, that Popular Clamors and Fury had been allowed the Reputation of Zeal, and the publick Sence; ſo that the Study to pleaſe ſome Parties hath indeed injured all.*

And again, *Take ſuch a Courſe as may either with Calmneſs and Charity quite remove the ſeeming Differences and Offences, by Impartiality; or ſo order Affairs in point of Power, that you ſhall not need to fear or flatter any Faction; for if ever you ſtand in need of them, or muſt ſtand to their Courteſie, you are undone: the Serpent will deceive the Dove: you may never expect leſs of Loyalty, Juſtice, or Humanity, than from thoſe who engage into Religious Rebellion; their Intereſt is always made God's, under the Colours of Piety; ambitious Policies*

march,

march, not only with the greatest Security, but Applauſe; as to the Populacy, you may hear from them Jacob's *Voyce, but you ſhall feel they have* Eſau's *Hands,* Ibid. *p.* 236.

To what I have ſaid, I ſhall be bold to add a *Juſtice* of *Proportion*; and thereupon, two Queſtions.

1. Why ſhould the *Presbyterians*, a *Small, Irregular Party*, pretend to give the Law to the *Supreme Authority*, the *Eſtabliſhed Conſtitution*; and incomparably the *greater* Part of the Nation?

2. Why ſhould thoſe People, that with a more than Barbarous Rigour preſs'd the Covenant, *Ejecting, Sequeſtring, Impriſoning* ſuch as refuſed to take it, and without Mercy or Diſtinction; Thoſe that in Publick barr'd *Non-Covenanters* the Holy Communion in expreſs Terms with *Adulterers*, *Slanderers* and *Blaſphemers*, affirming in the Pulpit, *That all the Non-Subſcribers to the Covenant, were Atheiſts?* Why ſhould (I ſay) thoſe People that with ſo unlimited a Tyranny impoſed upon the Nation a Rebellious League, to the Engagement of their *Souls* in *Taking* it, their *Liberties* and *Fortunes* in *Refuſing?* I ſay yet once again, Why ſhould thoſe People now at laſt demand an Intereſt in that Government, which Root and Branch they laboured to extirpate? Or with what Face can they pretend to a Right to an *Authority*, where, but by Mercy, they have none to *Life?* (I ſpeak of theſe late Libellers, and their Abettors.)

The late Kings Declaration concerning Scotland, *pag. Ibid.*

Let me be underſtood likewiſe by *Presbyterians* to intend thoſe of the *Scottiſh* Race, to whom we are beholden for our *Diſcipline*. That Faction firſt advanced it ſelf by Popular *Tumult* and *Rebellion*. *Knox* learned the Trick on't at *Geneva*, and brought it into *Scotland*: We had our Agents too, that did as much for us; Theſe Fellows conferr'd Notes, ſet the Wheel going, and we were never perfectly quiet ſince.

Upon the whole Matter aforegoing (in the Gentleman's own words) *we firmly build this Poſition*;

That the Presbyterian *Party ought* not, *either in Juſtice, or Reaſon of* State, *in any wiſe to be Encouraged, but rather Rejected; Neither ought they to be Protected in any Inconformity to the* Law, *but rather totally* Depreſſed.

His

His Second Quære is ſoon diſpatch'd, *viz.*

II. Qu. *Whether the* Presbyterian *Party may be Protected and Encouraged, and the* Epiſcopal *not Deſerted nor Diſoblig'd?*

Firſt, many things are *Poſſible*, which are neither *Juſt* nor *Rational*; and therefore it matters not much to allow it the *One*, if I prove it not to be the *Other*. Imagine ſuch a Contemperation of *Epiſcopal*, and *Presbyterian* Pretences, as might attone their preſent Diſagreements, yet where's the *King*? The Intereſt that's *Principal* in the *Concern*, is not ſo much as named in the *Queſtion*. The Quarrel was about the *Militia*, not *Lawn-Sleeves*, and the *Royal* Party is to be taken in, as well as the *Epiſcopal*.

The Truth of it is, This Gentleman does not find it convenient at preſent to move an utter Extirpation of Biſhops: but he propoſes That, which granted, would moſt infallibly produce it: A *Conſociation* forſooth, that for the better Credit of the Project, ſhall be called a *Regulated Epiſcopacy*; which in good honeſt Engliſh is next door to a *Tyrannical Presbytery*. In fine,

The Epiſcopal Authority is Deſerted and Diſobliged by the admittance of a Presbyterian *Competition.*

Yet pardon me, I have found a way to reconcile them; *Make but theſe ſquabling* Presbyterians Biſhops, *and the Work's done*; as *Presbyters*, they are *Encouraged*; and (I dare ſay) not *Diſobliged*, as *Biſhops*. The Plague of it is, there's neither *Juſtice* nor *Reaſon of State* for't, and ſo we are where we were again.

We ſhall make ſhort work too with his Third Queſtion; for in effect it ſpells juſt nothing.

III Qu. *Whether the upholding of both Parties by a juſt and equal accommodation, be not in it ſelf more deſirable and more agreeable to the State of* England, *than the abſolute exalting of the one Party, and the total ſubverſion of the other.*

I muſt

I muſt needs take notice here of two *Miſtakes*, the one in *propriety* of Language, *viz. the* Upholding *of both Parties.* One of thoſe Parties is not *up*, and cannot be *upheld.* The other ſhifts the *Queſtion*, and ſtates the Difference betwixt the EXALTATION *of the one*, and the SUBVERSION *of the other*, when all that we deſire, is but to keep both where they were, without *advancing* or *depreſſing* either.

If they have any Title to the Intereſt they challenge, the ſame had *Cromwel* to the *Crown.* This Queſtion muſt be better ſtated before we think it worth an Anſwer.

One Reflexion now upon the whole.

Here's *Exaltation*; and *Subverſion*: but not a Syllable of *Toleration*, and what's the reaſon of all this? They are afraid that would be granted, and how ſhould they do then to pick a Quarrel? Their way is never to be ſatisfy'd in *Conſcience*, with what the King can give in *Honour* and *Reaſon*, (His Sacred Majeſties Obſervation) *A grand Maxime with them was always to ask ſomething, which in Reaſon and Honour muſt be denied, that they might have ſome Colour to refuſe all that was in other things granted; ſetting Peace at as high a rate as the worſt Effects of War.* I have cited this already, but every Line drawn by that hand deſerves to be repeated.

Εἰκὼν Βασ. p. 170.

To this, there is another End, that's common to the Gang, which is, to draw an *Odium* upon one Party, and a *Compaſſion* toward the other. And other End than this do I ſee none at all, in his *Abſolute Exalting*, and *Total Subverſion.* We covet no Change, but deſire the contrary. How little ſoever it may appear to our purpoſe, 'tis very much to *theirs*, to have the People underſtand by *Abſolute Exalting*, the dangerous, and intolerable *Pride* of *Biſhops*; and by their *Total Subverſion*, on the other ſide, how ſadly the World goes with *the Profeſſors of the Goſpel.*

Theſe trivial Appearances have more weight than commonly the World imagines: *'Tis not ſo much* (as *Hooker* ſays) *how ſmall the Spark is that flyeth up, as how apt things about it are to take fire.* Their Buſineſs is to ſtir the Affections of the Common People, which muſt be done by Means and Ways, to wiſe men, in *themſelves, ridiculous*, but in their *Applications*, of moſt deſperate Effects.

I ſpeak

I ſpeak in earneſt, that very Tone they uſe in Preaching; that *Fellow-feeling-Tone* (as they would have it underſtood) is, I believe, of great uſe to their Buſineſs. I have obſerved the *Groans* that follow'd the *Abi-mee's*; and beyond doubt thoſe ſhiveling Affectations are not without their Benefit. That 'tis a forc'd and acted Paſſion, is evident in this; they almoſt all of them uſe the ſame *Emphaſis*.

I would not for my Hand let fall a Syllable that ſhould caſt a Scandal upon that Holy Ordinance: and with my Soul I reverence the Grave and Pious Clergy. We cannot attribute enough to God, aſſume too little to our ſelves: We cannot be too much afflicted for our Sins, nor too ſenſible of our own unworthineſs: yet I ſuppoſe a fit Chriſtian Sorrow may be contained within ſuch Terms as to reach *Heaven*, without diſturbing the *Congregation*. To come to a Church-door, and hear an Out-cry, as if a man were cutting for the Stone; and what's all this, but an afflicted Paſtor mourning for thoſe heavy Judgments that hang over the Land becauſe of *Common Prayer*; and then the Siſters Groan ſo ruthfully, you'd ſwear five hundred Women were in Labour. Away with theſe Oſtentations of Holineſs,——but firſt away with the *Diſcourſe* of *them*.

I muſt confeſs the Gentleman hath offered fair; and more I doubt than he can undertake for, were it accepted. What if Six *Presbyterians* of Seven, renounce his *Moderation*, and ſay, he treated without Commiſſion; where's his *Pacifick Coalition* then? 'Tis for a Parity they ſtruggle; which when they have got, they ſhall as much conteſt among themſelves to cruſh again, as ever they did to introduce. Juſt thus was the King treated; He was to Rule in *Conſociation* too, by the *Advice* of his *Presbyters*. And what came on't? The Factions interfer'd, the Change went round the Circle; and at long length, in the place of a moſt *Gracious Prince*, up-ſtarts a moſt *Tyrannical Protector*.

And yet I verily think, a Way may be found out to work upon theſe People: Let the King ſettle their ſtrict Form of Diſcipline, fill the Presbyteries with Epiſcopal Divines, and Elders of his own Party, I verily believe theſe very men would be as hot for Biſhops. I cannot comprehend the Temper of that *Sacrilegious Tenderneſs* that makes men *Digeſt* Biſhops *Lands*, and yet forſooth they cannot *Swallow* their *Sleeves*.

Only this Word. Some of the Authors I have quoted *for Epiſcopacy* (to deal ſincerely) may be as well produced *againſt It*: For

For That, let them look to't, I am Innocent, and my Cauſe clearer for it: They found it for their Intereſt to engage their Diſciples in many Opinions, which for their Honour they would not undertake to defend againſt their Equals.

I Should end here, were I not drawn beyond my purpoſe, by a *Second Part*, from the ſame Hand; which ſhould not yet divert me from my firſt Intention, could I but ſave my ſelf, in letting it abſolutely alone. By the Formalities of *Title* and *Connexion*, it ſeems related to the Former part, further than by ſome paſſages in the Treatiſe it appears to be: whereof ſome few I am concerned to Examine, and I ſhall ſhorten even that little I intended, as much as poſſible. He Calls it

A Deliberative Diſcourſe,

PROVING

That it is not agreeable to ſound Reaſon to prefer the Contracted and Dividing Intereſt of one Party, before the general Intereſt of Proteſtantiſm, *and of the whole Kingdom of* England, *in which the* Epiſcopal *and* Presbyterian *Parties may be happily United.*

We are agreed in *all* but in the *Main*; and as to That, I have already ſhewed, that in the Subject of our Difference, the *Presbyterian Party*, (that is, the *Kirk Party*) is divided from the *Proteſtant*: So that unleſs it can be made out, by the Judgment of the *Reformed Churches*, that *Prelacy* is *Anti-chriſtian*, and that *Inſtituted Ceremonies* are *Unlawful*; the Author of this *Deliberation* overthrows himſelf by his own Argument, of preferring *the General Intereſt of* Proteſtantiſm, *before the Contracted, and Dividing Intereſt of one Party*. We ſhould not take in *Diſcipline* within the Pale of *Religion*, but againſt that Party, which reckons it an *Eſſential* Mark of the *Church*. And let them take their Choice, whether it ſhall be accompted among things *Indifferent*, and *Neceſſary*: If the *Former*, *Obey the Impoſition*; if the *Latter*, let them produce their *Authority*.

If the *Foundation* be miſlay'd, the *Building* will hardly ſtand; or, which is worſe, it falls upon the *Builder*.

He ſayes, his Aim is *Unity*, and truly ſo is mine: but *Unity* in ſuch a Compoſition will never ſet us right. Two may agree in

the ſame point of Verity; but then that Truth muſt, for it ſelf, be entertain'd, without conſidering one another. If about any thing *Material* we differ, fly to the *Judge* of *Truth*, the *Scriptures* and the *Church*; if about *Leſs*, and *Common Matters*, go to the *Rule* of *Duty* (in ſuch Caſes) the ſetled *Law*. But I forget my ſelf.

It muſt needs be (ſays the *Deliberator*) *the Wiſdom of this State to ſmother all dividing Factions, and to aboliſh all partial Intereſts, that the common Intereſt of* England *may be alone exalted*, pag. 14.

The beſt Rule of Intereſt is the Law.

I hope he does not mean, by *State*, the *Keepers of the Liberties*; if the *Supreme Authority* of this Nation, as it is Legally Veſted in the *King*, the Man has kill'd himſelf. What are *Dividing Factions*, but ſuch Parties as ſtart from that Common Rule, the Law, which every State is bound upon a Principle of *Policy*, and *Honour* to preſerve Sacred, and Inviolable.

The *Law* is but the *Wiſdom* treaſured up of many Ages; only an amaſſe of all thoſe lights which long *Experience*, ſtrict *ſearch* and *Induſtry*; and many Conſultations of great Stateſmen, have given to the Diſcovery of our true Intereſt. Great Reaſon is there to Approve ſo great *Authority*: and as great ſhame it were not to avow what we our ſelves have done; (The Law being but an Univerſal Vote) beſides the penalty of *Diſobedience*. How *Mad* then, how *Ignoble*, and how *Deſperate* ſhall we eſteem that Faction, that breaks through all theſe Bonds of *Reverence*, *Honour* and *Prudential Security* to force that Sanctuarie, wherein as *Chriſtians*, and as *Men* we have repoſed, *Firſt*, the protection of our *Religion*; and *Then* the Arbitration of our Lives and Fortunes.

From ſuch Dividers, Heaven *deliver* us, firſt, and then *preſerve* us.

All Enterpriſes (ſays our Author very rationally) *that have their beginning in Judgment, and not in paſſion, are directed to a certain end ſet up as a mark, and that end is not a buſineſs at rovers; but ſome particular ſteddie iſſue of things certainly or probably apprehended and expected: Wherfore let wiſe Men conſider the mark, whereat they level, and to what Iſſue and ſtate of things their Actions tend.* Pag. 36. Moſt certain 'tis, without that mark men go they know not whither, *Firſt*, the *End*; *then*, the *Way*; is (I ſuppoſe) the Common Method of all *Wiſe Men*: and his advice to *ſuch*, to look before them, might have been ſpared, they would have don't

don't without it. Now to his Buſineſs: But firſt I'll clear the Way to't. The *Queſtion* is,

Whether the fomenting of theſe Diſcords (viz. in Matters of Diſcipline) *do not proceed from a Carnal Deſign?* And he debates the Matter with the *Epiſcopalians*, Pag. 33. *Here is a Numerous Party, not of the Dregs and Refuſe of the Nation, but of the Judicious and Serious Part thereof: What will they do with them? and how will they order the Matter concerning them? Would they deſtroy them? I ſolemnly profeſs that I abhor to think ſo by the Generality of the* Epiſcopal *Perſwaſion: I would diſdain to mention ſuch an unreaſonable Impiety, were it not to ſhew the inconſiderate and abſurd Proceedings of an unalterable Oppoſition, as that it cannot drive to any formed End and Iſſue. That Proteſtants ſhould deſtroy Proteſtants, for diſſenting in the point of Ceremonies, and ſole Juriſdiction of Biſhops, is ſo dreadful a violation of Charity and common Honeſty, that it is a moſt uncharitable and diſhoneſt thing to ſuppoſe it of them. What then? would they bear them down, or keep them under hard Conditions? Shall all Perſons that cannot yield exact Obedience to Eccleſiaſtical Injunctions, concerning all the Parts of the Liturgy, and Ceremonies, be ſuſpended and deprived as formerly? Shall Miniſters of this Judgment be caſt and kept out of Eccleſiaſtical Preferment and Employment? Shall all private Conferences of Godly, Peaceable Chriſtians, for mutual Edſification, be held unlawful Conventicles? It hath been thought by wiſe men to be againſt the Rules of Government, to hold under a rigid Yoke a free People, of ſuch a Number and Quality, and intermingled in all Eſtates and Ranks, and intimately conjoyned with all Parts of the Body Politique, that it is almoſt impoſſible to exclude their Intereſt from a conſiderable Share in Publick Actions.*

We are ſo often told of this *Judicious, ſerious Party*, pray let's allow them to be a Company of very fine Gentlemen, and mind our buſineſs. I think he ſays they are *numerous* too. So were the *Frogs that came into the King's Chamber:* and what of that?

In good truth, altogether, it is a very pretty *Anagram* of *Sedition*. If it wants any ſingle Circumſtances that's needful to procure a Tumult, I am exceedingly miſtaken.

Mark it; here's *Number*, *Conduct*, and Pretence of *Right*, to *Embolden*, and to *Fix* the *Multitude:* Then, to *Provoke*, and *Heighten* them, old Sores are rub'd up; they are minded how they were uſed ſo long ago; and hinted yet of worſe behind, if they have not a care betimes. What is all this to ſay, but,

Gentlemen, you remember how it was with you formerly; if you have a mind to have any more on't, ſo. But things are well enough yet; for be confident, you have thoſe will ſtand by you, that know what to do, and enough to make their hearts ake. Why 'tis againſt all Rule of Government, to put this yoke upon a Free People.

If the Author be within hearing, he ſhould do well to be his own Expoſitor. In the mean while compare we the Gloſs with the Text.

He ſpeaks now in his own words, which the Reader may find by conferring them with the entire matter of the laſt Quotation, to be extracted with ſtrict juſtice to his meaning.

Here is (ſays he) *a numerous Party, of the judicious and ſerious part of the Nation: what will they* (the Epiſcopalians) *do with them?* &c. *would they deſtroy them?* &c. *I ſolemnly profeſs, that I abhor to think ſo of the generality of the Epiſcopal perſwaſion,* &c. *ſhall they be ſuſpended, and deprived as formerly? ſhall all private conferences of Godly, peaceable Chriſtians, for mutual Edification be held unlawfull Conventicles? It hath been thought by wiſe men to be againſt the Rules of Government to hold under a rigid yoke a Free People of ſuch a Number, and Quality.* ———

This is cutting of a Mans Throat with a Whetſtone. Truly *Horace* his ſaying would ſound very well from this Gentleman.

———*Fungor vice Cotis, acutum*
Reddere quæ ferrum valet, exors ipſa ſecandi.

My Office is to *Whet*, not *Cut*.

To tye him up now to his own Philoſophy, which is, (according to his fore-alledged Poſition) that *all Rational Enterprizes propoſe ſome certain end, unto which end, all wiſe men conform their mediate Actions.* If it be ſo, (as we are agreed upon it) then by that very reaſon which directs him to chuſe the *means*, are we enabled likewiſe to gueſs the *end*.

His

His *End* he ſays is *Peace*; and in this Treatiſe he hath chalk'd his way to't. He's a *wiſe man*, and certainly proceeds in order to *the Mark he levels at*. Let him be judged by his own Rule.

Preſbyterian method of making Peace.

To mind the peeviſh, of old Grievances, and in ſo doing to tranſport the honeſt with a juſt ſenſe of new indignities; *Is this the way of Peace?*

To break a Solemn *Law*, that Law that ſaved the Breakers of it; to abuſe the Mercy of that Prince that made it: and to traduce the Government of his Father, whom they themſelves deſtroy'd; and which is worſe, to juſtifie all this; *Is this the way of Peace?*

To ſtartle the mad brutiſh Rabble with dangerous apprehenſions; to lay the juſtice of their cauſe before them, and when they are ripe for miſchief, to ſhew them Men, and Arms,—— *Is this the way of Peace?*——Then let me learn which is the way of *Tumult*.

Shall Proteſtants deſtroy Proteſtants, (ſays he) *for diſſenting in the point of Ceremonies?* No, but the *Law* ſhall deſtroy *Subjects*, for attempting to Rule their *Governors*.

Touching their *Conventicles*, ſince they fall in my way, I think of them, as of the Painter's *Bad God*, that made a *Good Devil*: I take them to be none of the beſt *Churches*, but for ought I know, they may make excellent———I beg only to obſerve now the *equity* of theſe good Folks.

Is it for the ſervice of Chriſt, and the encreaſe of his Kingdom the Church, that ſo many able Divines ſhould be debarred the uſe of the Lords Talents, that ſo many laborious Miniſters ſhould ſit ſtill in ſilence; that when Chriſt teacheth us to pray that the Lord would thruſt forth Labourers into his Harveſt, thoſe Labourers ſhould be thruſt out of his Harveſt? Surely this would make a cry in the ears of the Lord of the Harveſt. Pag. 31.

Do none of the *Woes* in the Goſpel belong to this talker of it? The ſervice of God went merrily on, in the *Thorough-Reformation*; did it not? When not a Miniſter kept his living but to the hazzard of his Soul; and in ſeveral places, (where the allowance was ſmall) neither *Sacrament* nor *Sermon*, for divers years together. But in thoſe days, the Covenant kept all in good Order.

With what a monſtrous confidence does this man preſs a *Text*, which the whole Nation knows it is clear againſt him! And all in Scripture phraſe forſooth: *Ne ſine formâ tantum ſcelus fiat*, for the honour of the exploit. Theſe People uſe *Religion*, juſt as the *Lon-*

don-

don-Cooks do their pickled *Barbaries*: they *garniſh* with it. It ſerves for every thing: I know not how it is, but they do't, becauſe they find the Women like it. When the *Epiſcopal*, and Loyal *Clergy*, their *Wives*, *Children*, and *Families* were ſwept entirely away by that SCOTCH PLAGUE the COVENANT; That made no cry ſure *in the ears of the Lord of the Harveſt*. Let the great Judge of all the world determine it.

If the neglect of Brotherly Pacification hold on, and the Hierarchy *reſolve upon their own advancement to the higheſt pitch, one may well conclude, that they make a full reckoning to wear out the Presbyterians, and to ſwallow up their Intereſt, conceiving they are able to effect it by degrees; and that greater changes than theſe have been wrought without much ado.* Pag. 39.

Let but the meaneſt Soul alive now judge of theſe mens Conſciences! (I ſpeak of thoſe that tumult ſince the *Act* of *Pardon*) As deep a forfeiture as ever was made by mortals, the King hath remitted to them. They have coſt the Nation more than they have left it worth, beſide the *Blood*, the *Grief*, and *Deſolation* they they have brought upon it. This notwithſtanding, they have at this inſtant the ſelf-ſame Intereſt they ever had, as to *Freedom*, and *Safety*, and otherwiſe *more*: They *keep* what they have *got*; *beg*, and get *more*; and are not yet *content* unleſs they *Govern* too. But this is but another Alarm, as who ſhould ſay, *Look to your ſelves my Maſters*; loſe not an Inch, for if you do, they'l do your Buſineſs *by degrees*.

By and by, among other concurring advantages, to the great Changes Queen *Elizabeth* wrought in Religion; he reckons this for one.

Popery (ſays he) *being in ſubſtance a Religion contrary to what was publickly profeſſed, had no advantage for encreaſe by publick Preaching, or Books, publickly allowed.* Pag. 42.

Nothing more certain, than that the Freedom of the *Preſs* and *Pulpit*, is ſufficient to embroyl the beſt ordered Government in the World.

All Governments have their *Diſorders* and their *Male-contents*: The *one* makes uſe of the *other*, and here's the ground of all Rebellions. Some *Real faults* are firſt found and laid open to the People, which, if in matter of popular Freedom, or Religion; ſo much the ſtronger is the Impreſſion; the vulgar being naturally ſtubborn, and Superſtitious. Bring it to this, a very little induſtry carries it on at pleaſure. They ſhall believe impoſſibi-

ties,

lities, Act eagerly, they know not what, nor why; and while they reach at *Liberty* graſp their own *Fetters*. Their unhappineſs is, they can better *Phanſie* a Government without any faults, than *brook* one that hath *ſome*. Add but to this diſtemper, Licentious Pamphlets, and Seditious Sermons, the world ſhall never keep that People quiet.

Wherefore, ſince on all hands it is agreed, that *Printing*, and *Preaching* in oppoſition to a *publick eſtabliſhment*, are of ſo dangerous conſequence, by the force of the Gentlemans own Rule we ought to hear no more of their Diſcipline from the *Preſs* or *Pulpit*. *Obſerve his next Coherence.*

There are now in England *thouſands of Miniſters diſſatisfied in the* Hierarchy *and* Ceremonies, *who are all competently and many of them eminently learned. They are not generally of light ſpirits, but ſteddy and well reſolved, and tenderly affected touching their ſpiritual liberties.* Pag. 42.

Take notice firſt, how *many*, and how *reſolute* they are. That is, take notice *again*, for we have had it exceeding often. His *Reſolute thouſands* make me think of the Tribes repairing to *David*. But they are diſſatisfy'd he ſays: it may be 'tis becauſe they are not *Biſhops*: Yet truly if they be ſo well *reſolved*, methinks they ſhould not be diſſatisfy'd with that they cannot help. I'll ask but two Queſtions, and I have done.

1. *Are any of thoſe tender-Conſcienc'd thouſands, that are ſo tenderly affected toward ſpiritual Liberties, thoſe Presbyterians that denied the King the freedom of His own Chaplains?*

2. *Had any of theſe eminently learned thouſands a hand in the Aſſembly's Letter to the Reformed Churches of* France, *the* Low-Countries, *&c.*— (as great a Schiſm in *Learning*, as the other was in *Religion*) *He comes now to the point indeed.*

Commonly (ſays he) *thoſe People who try all Doctrines by Scripture, and are ſwayed more by its Authority, than by the Ordinances and Cuſtoms of Men, do much heſitate and ſtagger concerning the ſole Juriſdiction of Biſhops, the Pomp of the* Hierarchy, *and Sacred Myſtical Ceremonies of Humane Inſtitution. And therefore let the Epiſcopal Party never look to be rid of theſe Difficulties, till they remove the Matter in Queſtion, whereat a knowing People are always ready to ſtumble,* pag. 43.

Well! ſince the Gentlemen will have it ſo, grant, for Diſpatch, the thing he preſſes; to wit, that they do *Heſitate* and *Stagger*. 'Tis hard, that when upon a private Search, the Queſtion

ſtion hangs in Ballance, the caſting in the Authority of the Church, and the great weight of Chriſtian Charity, ſhould not be yet enough to turn the Scale. *He that Doubts, Sins*; will not excuſe that man, who, *becauſe he thinks he ſtands, refuſes to take heed of falling.*

But let him *Doubt*, nay more, let him *Reſolve*; all is but for *Himſelf* ſtill, not for *Me*. When he comes once to muſter up his Thouſands, and talks of Parties, his Plea of Conſcience is gone, and doubtleſs, theſe violent and publick Sticklers for the Scrupulous (that is, in ſuch and ſuch Particulars) are the greateſt Enemies they have. It caſts a Scandal upon the very Cauſe of Conſcience, when thoſe who evidently want it in themſelves, plead for it in others. Upon this Subject, exceedingly well ſays Mr. *Lloyd*, in a late Treatiſe of *Primitive Epiſcopacy*, Pag. 80. *It becomes not good men to cenſure us for uſing thoſe Rites and Ceremonies, which we are perſwaded not to be prohibited by God's Law, and both they and we do ſurely know to be commanded to be uſed, by Man's Law duly made, which is God's Ordinance, to which we muſt be ſubject for Conſcience ſake.* And a little after,——*If any will attempt to be Authors of Combinations, to extort, by ſhew of Multitudes, and by Tumults, the Alteration or Abrogation of any part of the Eſtabliſhed Laws, Civil or Eccleſiaſtical, they will thereby evidently manifeſt themſelves to be but meer Pretenders to a Tender Conſcience, and Power of Godlineſs; for they that labour to extort a part, if they prevail, muſt have the whole in their power. And can they that attempt ſo great Robbery, love God, and the Power of Godlineſs? By this curſed Fruit we know theſe to be moſt vile Hypocrites.* Now to our Adverſary.

The Gentleman deſires to clear the *Presbyterians* of being no *Phanaticks*; and we'll give him the hearing.

It is ſaid that the Presbyterians *promoted the King's Return, not out of good will to His Majeſty, or a love of Order and Unity, but out of fear of being deſtroy'd by the* Phanaticks, *Pag.* 54. To this I ſhall ſay little, but that I believe there was more in't than ſo. Let him argue upon it.

The pretended Reaſon of their Inſincerity, ſeems to me to add much to their Reputation in that behalf: For if the Phanaticks *would deſtroy them, it is manifeſt that they are none of them.* Phanaticks *would not deſtroy themſelves willingly. The ſeveral various Sects will wrangle with each other in Verbal Conteſts; but they never knowingly plotted or banded againſt each other upon the account of their different Opinions,*

but

but did all unite in one common Principle of pretended Liberty of Conſcience, and in one Common Cauſe of Univerſal Toleration, Ibid.

A pleaſant Reaſoning! A man would think *Chriſtianity* as ſtrong a Tie as *Phanaticiſm*; and yet we ſee *Chriſtians* deſtroy one another. But come to the Point. What's more familiar, than for a couple of Curs to hunt the ſame Hare, and when they have catch'd her, worry one another for the Quarry? I'll tell this Gentleman a thing now, ſhall make him take me for a Conjurer: I'll tell him the true Reaſon why thoſe *Presbyterians* help'd his Majeſty in, that are not Quiet now they have him: Not for fear of the *Phanaticks*; he made that Objection himſelf, for ought I know: But here 'tis; (ſtill ſaving to my ſelf the Freedom of my interpreting my own Words.)

I ſpeak only of thoſe Presbyterians *that ſince His Majeſties happy Return, are yet fomenting of new Troubles.*

The *Presbyterians* do their own Buſineſs in the King's Name.

The *Presbyterian* Faction have been ever conſtant to the Rule and Method of doing their *own* Buſineſs in the *King*'s Name; and this went far with the ſimple and well-meaning People; but let not any man believe this Intereſt did their Work. The ruin of his bleſſed Majeſty, was that unhappy Agreement with the Covenanters in 1639. after ſo horrid an expence of *Time* and *Money*, as gave the greateſt benefit Imaginable, to their Intereſt, and an equal diſadvantage to his Own. The King by this expence being grown Poor; and They Strong by the Delay, was more and more oppreſſed, till at the laſt the Field was clear'd: He and his Party in appearance Loſt.

What did theſe great Pretenders then for the good of *King* and *Church*, but ſhare the Booty, and exerciſe a Power themſelves ten thouſand times more Turkiſh than ever they called That they had aboliſhed? What hindered then the Settlement of this Nation upon its *Legal Baſis*, (as they phraſe it) if the good People had but had a mind to it? Who kept the King from his Parliament? Or was he ever nam'd? but with relation to the Loſs of *Right* as well as *Power*.

Well, but at laſt, theſe people take their turns too, and then the King's a Gracious Prince again. Theſe Factions are of kin to *Montaignes* Family, where the Son beats the Father from generation to generation. Now we come near our purpoſe.

Look back into the *Scotch* defeat in 1648. Not any thing more clear ſure, than that the *Presbyterian* Party, would they but frankly have cloſed with the Kings Tryed Friends in that Engagement; without a Miracle, they muſt have carried it. Thoſe Few they had, did well nigh all that was conſiderable in the Action.

See afterward, in 50, and 51. how dirtily upon this very accompt, the *Presbyterian* crew treated his Majeſty: and look quite through their *Interregnum*; they have obſerved the ſame indiſpoſition of uniting with the Kings Party, but ſtill ſhaking the Head, with an *Alaſs poor Gentleman!* at the mention of our perſecuted Soveraign. Not to inſiſt upon Particulars; *They* never would joyn with *Us* to help His *Majeſty*, *we* never refuſed with *them*. Now comes the Myſterie of the Reſerve. Say they,

If we can order Matters ſo as to get the Kings *Perſon* in the head of us, and keep out his *Party*. Their hands are ty'd by a Principle of Duty; Our Power is enlarged upon an Intereſt of favour, and we can play our Game at pleaſure. That is, Wee'l not forget to mind him of his Reſtorers, and now and then a Whiſper, how Debaucht the Gentry's grown: how unfit this man is for *Truſt*, that for *Temper*, and a Third for *Conduct*.

We may then propoſe the naming of Officers, and we're to blame if we forget our ſelves. By theſe Degrees and ways Time and a little Patience will wear them out; or if it were nothing elſe, the very Poverty we have reduc'd them to, would make them ſoon Contemptible.

Whereas ſhould we but offer once a General agreement with that Party, our Deſign's ſpoyl'd, for they'll be more than we ſhall well know how to maſter. No, no, that muſt not be. Our Intereſt lyes to take in juſt ſo many, as when they have done our Work, we may be able to turn out again. So much for That.

This is the very Soul of the rigid *Presbyterians*. *Where is our Charity and Regard* (they cry) *to publick tranquillity, if we reject the ſure and only means of Concord*, Pag. 60. He ſhould have rather ſaid, where is our *Providence*. if we admit ſo ſure an Introduction to Confuſion. To comply with one Importunity of this nature, is to Authorize, and encourage more, and to pleaſe all, is totally Impoſſible.

The *Canons* ſtick in his Stomack notably, they force too much, and bring in *Popery*. *Shall not the Laity be allow'd to ſearch the Scriptures*,

ptures, nor try the Doctrines delivered, but acquieſce in what their Teachers ſay, without the exerciſe of their own Reaſoning, or Judgment of Diſcretion? Pag. 61.

Yes, let them *ſearch the Scriptures*, as their *Teacher* may the *Laws*; yet by their Leave, the *Church*, and *Bench* muſt interpret them. What Difference is there betwixt King *James*'s *Phanaticks*, and King *Charle*'s, ſave that they aſcribe one and the ſame Effect to ſeveral Cauſes; both claiming equal *Certainty*; the *One*, from his *Judgment of Diſcretion*: the *Other*, from *Divine Impulſe?* What Work ſhall we have when every Taylor ſhall with his *Judgment of Diſcretion* cut out his own Diſcipline, and ſet it up for a Faſhion. *When theſe Men and their Bibles are alone together*, (as *Hooker* ſays) what *Phrenſies* do they call Directions of the Spirit? He comes now to the Politicks.

It is a chief point of knowledge in thoſe whoſe work it is to mould and manage a Nation according to any order of things, to underſtand what is the temper of the people, what Principles poſſeſs and govern them, or conſiderable Parties of them, and to what paſſe things are already brought among them, Pag. 62.

The more a Prince conſiders this, the leſs will he afford a *Scotiz'd Engliſh Presbyterian*. By Temper he's *Ambitious*; *and Unthankful*; ever *Craving*; and never *Full*: Govern'd by Principles *Inſociable*, and *Cruel*. He rates his Party, his Piety, and his Kindneſs twenty times greater then they are, and rather than confeſs that he is out in his Reconing, he ſhall face any other man down that *One*, on the wrong ſide of a Cipher is 1000.

Laſtly, in Conſidering to what paſs things are brought among them, he will bethink himſelf likewiſe how they came to be ſo.

A State may probably root out ſuch Opinions as it conceives to be heterodox and inconvenient, by uſing great ſeverity in the beginning, when the Opinions are but newly ſowed in mens minds, and the People are of ſuch a nature, as to abhor dangers, and aim to live ſecurely, and when the Nation in general is devoted to the ancient cuſtom of their Fore-fathers. But the ſame courſe may not be taken when the Opinions have been deeply rooted and far ſpread, by long continuance, in a Nation of a free ſpirit, and zealous; and the generalitie of thoſe, that in a Lawſence are called Cives, *do not deteſt them,* Pag. 63.

Truly in this Caſe, if Heterodox *Opinions* cannot be rooted out, the *Men* that publiquely maintain them muſt: and the rather, if they be *free*, and *jealous*: for there's the more danger in their further Progreſs. Eſpecially if ſuch Opinions preſcribe from the

ſucceſs of Treaſon. For There, even in matters of themſelves very Allowable, I would not leave the leaſt mark of an approbation. It gives too great an honour to *Rebellion*. Provided always that I act at Liberty, and free from Pre-ingagements.

Where there is ſuch a Real Cauſe of Fear, as is here ſhadow'd to us; That Prince that loves his Empire, or his *Honour*, muſt ſtruggle with it betimes: *Safety* or *Pleaſure*, ſuch a people perhaps will be content to allow in exchange for ſovereignty: But for the reſt, that Prince is loſt that puts himſelf on the Asking ſide.

It never fayls, this Rule: *when ſubjects earneſtly preſs for more than they ought, they aym at more yet than they ask.* They are already paſt their Duty, and ſhort of their Ambition.

In ſuch a Caſe, as This, Rigour is the only Remedy: great Aptneſs to forgive is entertain'd with greater Proneneſſe to offend.

Let it be thought upon; if any Danger, where it lies. Not in the bare Conceit of Phancy, or Diſlike, for or againſt the Matter in Diſpute, but in the means that give Form, Growth, and Strength, to thoſe unquiet Motions; and that aſſemble thoſe Looſe ſcatter'd Sparks into one Flame.

Theſe Inſtruments are Mercenary *Pulpit-men*, and *Scriblers*; 'tis but removing them, and the Danger's over.

Leaſt he ſhould ſeem to want a Colour for theſe Freedoms, he tells us, that *The preſent Age being more diſcerning, all ſorts affect a greater Liberty of Judgment and Diſcourſe, than hath been uſed in Former times*, Pag. 65.

This we obſerv'd, but did not till now impute it to *Diſcretion*. Suppoſe they ſhould grow more and more *Diſcerning*, and their Deſires of Liberty grow too; would not theſe People ſoon grow Wiſe enough to *Govern*, that are already grown too good to *Obey*? 'Tis dangerous truſting of them; yet he aſſures us otherwiſe.

This Kingdom after the removing of foundations, is by a marvellous turn re-eſtabliſhed upon its ancient baſis. And verily that which hath wrought the change will ſettle it; that which hath brought ſuch things to paſs, will keep them where they are, if we do not overlook and ſleight it. And what was it but the conſent of the Univerſality, the Vote of all England, *Pag.* 66.

If all that acted toward this late and bleſſed Change, meant to Fix here: this needleſs, ill timed, and dividing Controverſie, concerning Ceremonies, would have been ſpared and thoſe which

which move the Queſtion with ſuch earneſtneſs; at their *Prayers*, rather, than theſe *Expoſtulations*. 'Tis an ill Age when Thieves arreign the Law. That ſort of men which ruin'd us, propoſes now that very Method by which we were deſtroyed, to ſettle us; inviting the diſtemper'd people by this Overture, to take their *Poyſoners* for their *Phyſicians*.

'Tis very true, that (under Providence) It was the Common *Vote*, and ſtirring of the *Nation*, reſtored the *King*, and the *Law*: and ſhall we now reſtrain that univerſal comfort to the Particular Advantage of that ſingle Party, that firſt invaded them? How great a blemiſh were it to the Honour, and Wiſdom of the Nation, after ſo long, and hard a Tugg, to throw away the ſumm of the Conteſt: as if we had wrangled all this while for Shadows? But to explain my ſelf.

They that think matter of *Ceremony* to be the True reaſon of the Difference on either ſide, miſtake themſelves. It is the *Law* it ſelf, which is *aſſaulted* by the One Party, and *defended* by the Other, in the *Particular* of *Ceremonies*: and it is the King himſelf that is affronted in the Indignities they caſt upon Biſhops. To leave the matter clear: There is a Faction which would over-throw the Law, and ſet up themſelves above it; and Theſe Contrivers put the people upon Cavilling for Ceremonies. *They* Innocently, under a Miſtake of *Conſcience*, advance an Intereſt of *Uſurpation*, taking that to be only a Diſpute about the Lawfulneſs of the *Practice*, which rationally pinches upon the validity of the *Power*. It ends in This.

Grant once that a Popular Vote *may over-rule a* Stated Law, *(though but to the value of a Hair) the vertue of that Reaſon extends to our* Freedoms, Lives, and Fortunes, *which by the ſame Rule, they may take away as well as* Ceremonies. And (as the caſe ſtands) *Kings* as well as *Biſhops*.

But, *ſeeing this great Revolution hath not happened by the prevailing force of one Party, but by the unſtrained motion of all* England: *what reaſon is there that one Party ſhould thruſt the other out of its due place of reſt, upon the Common Foundation*, Pag. 67.

No reaſon in the World. *The Law is our common reſting place*, the main *Foundation* upon which we are all to Bottom. The Law is an Impartial Judg, let that determine, which place belongs to *Biſhops*, which to *Presbyters*, what *Ceremonies* are *lawful*, and which *not*.

This

This is a *ſhort* and a *ſure* way, worth forty of his *Coalition.*

Having *preſsed Union* hitherto, *he proceeds now to remove certain impediments*; *One* whereof *is an erroneous Judgment touching the times foregoing the late Wars*, Pag. 73.

In truth 'tis pitty the people are no better Inſtructed. Then let them know from me, thoſe very Principles theſe folks contend for, were brought by *Knox* about 1558. from *Geneva* into *Scotland*, from thence they were tranſmitted into *England*, ſince which time, the abettors of them in both Nations, have never ceaſed by *Leagues*, *Tumults*, *Rebellions*, and *Uſurpations*, to embroyl the publique Peace, and affront the Supreme Authority.

They have formally proceeded to the *Depoſing of Princes*, the exerciſe of an abſolute Authority over the *Subjects*: the *abrogation* of *Laws*, the *Impoſition* of *Taxes*, and in fine to all extremities of rigour as well in matters of *Liberty*, as of *Conſcience.* He that deſires a *Presbytery*, let him but read *Presbyter*, for *King*, in the 1 *Sam.* 8. and he ſhall there find what he is reaſonably to expect. Theſe were the pranks fore-going the late Wars: and ſuch as theſe will be again, if people be not the Wiſer.

But our Camerade will be none of the Party ſure: For, *I abhor* (ſais he) *to take upon me the defence of our late diſtracted times: the diſtempers thereof I would not in any wiſe palliate*, Pag. 74.

Intereſt of *England.* Part 1. Page 13. Part 1. Page 41. Ibid. 53

Is the wind in that door? Now do I feel by his Pulſe, that *Croſton's* laid by the Heels. He hath forgot, that the *War was between the King, and both Houſes of Parliament*: And that *the Presbyterian Party in* England *never ingaged under a leſs Authority than that of both Houſes of Parliament. And that* Presbyterians *have never diſclaimed, or abandoned their lawful Prince.* It may be he means, that he will not juſtifie the Diſtempers of the other ſide. But why do we conteſt? ſince he tells us, that, *It is the part of weak and ſelfiſh minds to contract Religion to certain modes and forms which ſtand not by Divine Right, but by the wills of men, and which are of little efficacy, and very diſputable, and if ſuppoſed lawful, ought to be governed by the rule of Charity*, Pag 75.

I would fain know, which is more tolerable; for the *Church* to impoſe upon the *People*, or the *People* upon the *Church*? For the

the *People* on the one ſide, to *except* all, or for the *Church* on the other ſide, to *bind* all. *Order* it *ſelf* is of Divine appointment; but the *manner* of Ordering, (ſave where God himſelf hath preimpoſed) is left to Humane liking and Diſcretion. *To think* (ſays he) *that none is a good Chriſtian, a ſound Proteſtant, a fit Miniſter, that cannot ſubſcribe to ſuch Modes, and Forms, proceeds from a narrow, and ignoble Judgment*, Pag. 75.

He may be a fit Teacher for *Geneva*, that cannot ſubſcribe to the Form of *England*; and a fit Miniſter for *England*, that cannot conform to the practice of *Geneva*; they may be both *good Chriſtians* too, and *ſound Proteſtants*; yet neither of them *fit* in tranſpoſition. 'Tis one thing to be qualifi'd for the Miniſterial *Function*, and another thing to be fit for ſuch or ſuch a *Conſtitution*. 'Tis true, he *Officiates* as a *Miniſter*; but *thus*, or *ſo*, as a *Subject*; and that's the real ground of their Exception. They do not willingly admit the King's Authority in Matters of the Church; and that, which effectually is but their own Ambition, they obtrude upon the World as a high point of Tenderneſs to the People. There are beyond all doubt, weak Conſciences, fit Objects for Indulgence; but the leſs pardonable are their Miſleaders, whoſe Buſineſs 'tis for their own ends to engage the ſimple Multitude in painful and inextricable Scruples.

Let them Preach downright Treaſon, ſtir up the Rabble to Tumult and Sedition; if they chance to be caught and queſtioned for it, ſee with what ſoftneſs they treat their Fellows, and with what ſupercilious gravity their Superiors.

When ſome degree of forwardneſs breaks forth, it is encountred with that ſeverity which hazards the undoing of the weak part, that ſhould and might be healed, pag. 78. And again, to the ſame effect, (concerning *Crofton*'s Commitment, I imagine) *But ſuppoſe that ſome of this way were guilty of ſome provoking forwardneſs, ſhould grave Patriots and wiſe Councellours thereupon deſtroy the weak part, or rather heal it? A prudent Father is not ſo provoked by the ſtubbornneſs of a Child as to caſt him out, and make him deſperate while there is yet hope concerning him. It is meet indeed for Princes to expreſs their juſt indignation, when Subjects preſuming on their clemency do not contain themſelves within their duty? and the ſeaſonable expreſſion of ſuch diſdain, wiſely managed, is of great force in Government: nevertheleſs if it get the maſtery it is exceeding perillous. It was the Counſel of indignation that proceeded from* Rehobohams *young Councellors*, Pag. 81.

What

What this language deſerves both from the King and his Council, let thoſe that have Authority to puniſh, Judge.

When Governours reſent the non-compliances of a party, their beſt remedy is to remove the occaſions, when it may be done without croſſing the Intereſts of State or Maximes of Government, Pag. 83. That is, if the *People* will not yield to the *Prince*, the *Prince* ſhould do well to yield to the *People*. A moſt excellent way for a King that hath to do with Presbyterians: where he ſhall be ſure never to want ſubjects for his Humility, nor ever to get thanks for his Labour.

Where there are many ſufferers upon a Religious account, whether in truth or pretence, there will be a kind of glory in ſuffering, and ſooner or later it may turn to the Rulers detriment, Pag. 84.

There will not be many *Sufferers*, where there are not many *Offenders*; and there will not be many *Offenders*, where an early ſeverity is uſed. But however, if any hazard be, he that *prints* it, *dictates*, *encourages*, and *promotes* it deſerves to ſuffer with the foremoſt. But the Gentleman begins now to talk like a Chriſtian. *I deteſt* (ſaies he) *and abhor the Tumults, and inſurrections of the People, and the reſiſting of the Sovereign Power*, Pag. 98.

This is honeſtly ſaid yet: But hold a little. What is that *Sovereign Power*, which he abhors ſhould be reſiſted by the *Tumults of the People?* Even *the two Houſes in Co-ordination with the King*. A little further, *I am perſwaded* (ſays he) *that the Generality of the* Presbyterian *Denomination would endure extremities, before they would revenge or defend themſelves by unlawful means; as rebelling againſt their lawful Sovereign*, Pag. 98.

Intereſt of *England*, p. 94.

This we ſhall underſtand too by confronting it: and find it, only the old Fallacy, a little better colour'd *This part* (ſays he) *of the ſupreme power* (meaning the two Houſes) *is indeed capable of doing wrong; yet how it might be guilty of* Rebellion, *is more difficult to conceive.* Now if the two Houſes cannot *Rebel*, as being part of the Supreme Power; (by his Argument) neither can the Presbyterians, in complyance with that Party: So that by this miſplacing of the Supreme Authority, whatever hath been Acted by vertue of any Commiſſion from the two Houſes, may be done over again, and no Rebellion.

By this device, he only diſavows Rebellion ſo far as this or that, is not Rebellion according to his propoſition, although the Law determine otherwiſe. This is no other

other than what was ever maintained even by thoſe that ſtood themſelves upon the higheſt terms of diſobedience. Did ever any man ſay, *This is Rebellion, and I'll juſtify it* ? Nay, I ſhould be glad to hear any of them ſay, *This* was *Rebellion, and I'm ſorry for it. But it is evident that the Presbyterians love the King, and Kingly Government, and accompt themſelves happy in his Majeſties Clemency, allowing them a juſt, and inoffenſive Liberty in certain matters of Conſcience*, Pag. 101.

The *Presbyterians* may find many things to thank his Majeſty for: but I would they could hit upon a handſomer manner of doing it; and not perpetually to be craving *more*, when they ſhould be doing him ſervice for what they have receiv'd *already*. They love the King, they ſay ; but then their Love is Conditional, they muſt have ſomething for it.

Would they expoſe themſelves for twenty years together, to *Goals and Gibbetts*, all ſorts of *Hazards*, and *Misfortunes* for their Prince, and at the laſt ſit down, and ſtarve Contentedly, out of a ſence of honourable Loyalty?

That Subject is not right, who hath not brought his mind up to this Frame ; however unhappy he may think himſelf in ſuch Encounters as put him to the Tryal of his utmoſt Virtue.

Wiſe men inform us, that a Prince by adhering to one Faction, may in time lift it up above his own Imperial Intereſt, which will be forced to give way to it as the leſſer to the greater. And the prime Leaders of the potent Faction will ſway more than the Prince himſelf. They will become arrogant, unthankful, and boundleſs in their ambitious deſigns, Pag. 104.

This is a good Rule, but ill applied ; unleſs return'd upon himſelf. I hope he will not call *That* Party a *Faction*, which ſubmits all its Actions to the clear Letter of the Law ; and he will hardly prove *That* to be *None*, which croſſes *This*. If ſo, let Common Reaſon judge betwixt us.

There is a ſaying, which by many hath been taken up for a Proverb, No Biſhop No King. *I do not well underſtand the riſe of this ſaying, and therefore dare not ſpeak in derogation of their Judgments who were the Authors of it, But upon the matter it ſelf, I crave to make this modeſt Animadverſion. And firſt it is degrading to the tranſcendent intereſt of Sovereigny , to affix unto it a neceſſity of any one partial intereſt for its ſupport: For independency and ſelf-ſubſiſtence, without leaning upon any Party, is a Prince's ſtrength and glory. Alſo it makes that Party over-confident, and its oppoſite too deſpondent. Such ſayings as impo-*

a Princes neceſſary dependence on any particular Party, may in the mouths of Subjects be too preſumptious, and in the mouth of a Prince too unwary, Pag. 106.

If we are not yet inſtructed in the Weight, and Reaſon of that ſaying, —— *NO BISHOP NO KING*; Sure we are paſt learning any thing. We found the ſad truth of this Judgment, in the event of the late War; but that's no Rule. By *No Biſhop No King*, is not intended that Biſhops are the Props of Royalty, nor do the Epiſcopalians underſtand it ſo: but that both one and the other are Objects of the ſame Fury; only the Church goes Firſt: ſo that without *preſumption*, a *Subject* may *affirm* it; and without loſs of Honour a *Prince* may *grant* it.

I might draw Arguments from the Agreement of their *Original*, the likeneſs of their *Conſtitution*, the Principles by which they are *Supported*; and that they lye expoſed to the ſame Enemies, and the ſame method of Deſtruction. But this would ſeem to imply a more Inſeverable Intereſt than I aim at, and raiſe the Clergy above the proper State, and Orb of Subjects. My meaning is more clear and open.

All Popular Factions take the *Church* in their way to the *State*; and I am to ſeek where ever any Prince quitted *Epiſcopacy*, and ſaved *Himſelf*. That is, his *Royal Dignity*; for the empty *Name* of *King*, is but the *Carkaſs* of Majeſty. It is with the unruly Populacy, as it is with raging Tides, they preſs where the Bank is weakeſt, and in an inſtant over-run all. If they had either Modeſty, or Conſcience, they would not force ſo far: if they have neither, will they ſtop There? What did the late King Grant? or rather, what Deny? till by their mean Abuſe of his unlimited Conceſſions, he loſt his Crown, and Life? Yet what aſſurance Words could give him, he wanted not: Words wrapt up in the moſt Tender and Religious Forms imaginable. But what are Words, where a Crown lyes at ſtake?

In fine, *Treaſon's a Canker*; *and where it ſeizes, that Prince muſt early cut off the Infected Part, if he would ſave the Sound.*

The true Church lies in the middle between two extreams, Formaliſts, and Fanaticks. They are of circumſpect and regular walking, no way forward in attempting, or deſiring alterations in a Civil State. A Prince doth hold them in obedience under a double Bond. For they know they muſt needs be ſubject not only for Wrath, but for Conſcience ſake. Indeed we will not conceal, that in lawful ways they aſſert that Liberty which is ſetled by the known Laws and Fundamental Conſtitutions, the

the maintaining whereof is the Prince's as much as the Peoples ſafety, Pag. 116.

If to be *no way Forward in promoting Changes in the Civil State*, be a mark of the Church: The *Presbyterians* are out of the Pale. It's truth, they are it ſeems, Aſſertors of *Lawful Liberty*, in *Lawful ways*: but how is that I pray'e? Did they not tell us this, when their Swords were at our Throats: when it was Death to aſſiſt the King? When they were forc'd to fly to the *Equitable* ſence of the Law, and quit the *Literal*: and fetch their Arguments from *Inſpiration*, becauſe they had none in *Reaſon*.

I ſhall here put an End to this Diſcourſe, which is become much longer already than I meant it, by reaſon of his Addition. *Croftons* ill Fortune I find hath made him *wary*, but not *humble*; for he preſſes the ſame Things in ſubſtance ſtill, though in ſomewhat a differing manner of Reſpect, and ſeeming Candour. The good Words he gives, belong to thoſe Perſons which he ſhall vouchſafe to Call *ſerious*, and to think worthy of them; and the Government is to be moulded and diſpoſed of as he pleaſes.

Finally, he pretends to aim at a Fair, and Chriſtian Accord, and yet proceeds in a direct method of Dividing: by ſharp and ſcandalous Reflections upon the Kings Party.

To ſay no more, his Reaſonings are *Diſhonourable* to the memory of the *Late* King: *Seditious* and *Provoking* to the *People*: *Bold* and *Impoſing* in *themſelves*; *Repugnant* to the eſtabliſhed *Law*, and to the main ſcope of the *General Pardon*.

How out of all theſe ill Ingredients ſhould be compoſed a National, and healing Balſom, I ſhall now give the Reader leiſure to conſider.

Male imperatur, ubi regit Vulgus Duces.

FINIS.